U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

GLOBAL NUCLEAR ENERGY PARTNERSHIP)
PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL)
IMPACT STATEMENT)
PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING)

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS had in the above-entitled cause at The Barber & Orberwortmann Horticultural Center, 227 North Gougar Road, Joliet, Illinois, on the 22nd day of February, A.D. 2007, at 5:30 p.m.

REPORTED BY: JACQUELINE M. TIMMONS, CSR, RMR, RDR.

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Okay. I believe we can get started. Thank you so much for coming this evening. We really appreciate it. And welcome to this public scoping meeting on the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership. The development of an environmental impact statement for this project by the Department of Energy's Office of Nuclear Energy is required by the National Environmental Policy Act.

My name is Barry Lawson. And I will serve as the facilitator for this event. My role is to ensure that this meeting runs on schedule and that everyone has an opportunity to speak. I am not an employee of the Department of Energy nor an advocate for any party or position.

At the registration table when you came in, you should have received a participant's packet. If not, if you want to raise your hand, I have been told the staff could bring one to you. It contains important information on this presentation this evening and is a convenient place to take notes during the briefing that will follow in a few minutes.

There are three purposes for tonight's meeting. The first is to provide information on the content of the proposed Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, the PEIS for short, and on the National Environmental Policy Act, that's NEPA, which governs that process.

The second purpose is to answer your questions on the proposed PEIS and NEPA, and the third purpose is to receive and record your formal comments on the scope of the proposed PEIS. The agenda for tonight's meeting reflects these purposes. We will begin with an introductory remarks by video by Mr. Dennis Spurgeon, which is DOE's Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy. That will be followed by a presentation by Mr. Richard Black, who is to my right, regarding the proposed programmatic environmental impact statement for the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership. Mr. Black is the Associate Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Office of Nuclear Energy.

To answer questions that you may have following these presentations, the project staff will again be available throughout the evening at the display tables, which is in the room behind us

here. If you haven't visited it, I certainly encourage you to do so. There they can discuss the PEIS and the NEPA process, as well as discuss the contents of the printed materials that are on display and the materials that are covered in Mr. Black's presentation.

Following Mr. Black's presentation, we will recess so that you may pursue those further questions with the available project staff, and we will also take that time to get set up for the public comment period, and I will get the official list of people who will be making presentations. I will then reconvene and once we do reconvene, the court reporter will be available to receive your comments and suggestions regarding the scope of the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership's proposed PEIS. All your comments will be transcribed and made part of the permanent record.

Right now we will begin with the video presentation by Mr. Dennis Spurgeon. And if you can set that up, that would be great. Thanks.

(Video presentation made by Mr. Dennis Spurgeon.)

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Now, as announced,

I am pleased to introduce to you Mr. Richard Black, who is DOE's Deputy Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy. Mr. Black will discuss the background of the project and the purpose and basic elements of the proposed Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement.

Mr. Black.

MR. BLACK: Thank you, Barry.

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I am pleased to be here tonight to welcome you to the public scoping meeting for GNEP. As Assistant Secretary Spurgeon said, this meeting is really for you. It is your opportunity to present your concerns, your issues, your suggestions regarding the scope of the proposal that's very important to us and also to give us your suggestions and concerns about reasonable alternatives to the proposals.

We are here tonight because local organizations were given an opportunity to provide or to request funding to do some further study at the site analysis. And General Electric at Morris, Illinois, was one of the organizations that responded to the DOE funding opportunity assistance

request. Also we are here because Argonne National Laboratory was selected by DOE as a potential host for the research facility that I will talk about later.

So, really, before I give you an opportunity to make statements, let me describe how we wish to proceed here tonight. First of all, I want to put the GNEP proposal into perspective. I would like give you a basic overview of nuclear power and spent fuel management. Then I would like to talk about the NEPA process, which will help us analyze the GNEP proposal and the alternatives that go along with it. I would like to talk also about the domestic part of the GNEP, as well as the international part of the GNEP, and tell you where we are in the process of the environmental impact statement process and the programmatic impact statement process.

So nuclear power. Nuclear power provides 20 percent of the electricity in the United States today. As Assistant Secretary Spurgeon said, the nuclear power reactor source is a clean source, in that it doesn't emit air pollution or greenhouse gases that contribute to

the climate change, conditions that we have. It also provides 70 percent of the emission free electricity generated in the United States today. The other 30 percent is largely hydroelectric, solar and wind with a little bit of geothermal. A reactor starts -- if I can get my pointer working here. This is a reactor, and in it has uranium fuel down at the bottom and when control rods are moved, the fuel starts a fissioning process. The fissioning process is a splitting of the uranium atom. That splitting process, the fissioning process produces huge amounts of heat. The heat is then transferred to water that is circulated through the reactor core. The water then moves over to a steam generator, where the water heats up steam on what we call the secondary side. The steam, in turn, is under high pressure, high heat, moves outside containment and over here in the turbine building, it turns turbines. It is like in a jet engine. Those are the turbines that basically are out there, and the turbines, in turn, turn the electrical generator, which produces electricity.

After completing an operating cycle,

typically 16 or 18 to 24 months, some of the uranium fuel in the reactor is considered used up or spent. In other words, it doesn't support an effective fissioning process at this point. It is then removed from the core. That fuel element is removed from the core and stored safety on site until it can be disposed of later.

We now have two approaches to spent fuel management. Currently in the United States and several other countries, we have what is called once-through cycle, meaning the fuel goes one through the core, and then it is removed from the core, safely stored on site, cooled down. The long-lived radioactive, it decays, in some aspects, both in heat and in radioactive isotopes, and then, ultimately, it is going to go to a geologic repository, which at this time is considered to be Yucca Mountain in Nevada.

The closed cycle. The GNEP proposal is one that we are going to say is a recycling option for spent fuel, and it's a closed cycle process. What is compelling us to think about GNEP at this time? Certainly, we know that with the expanding economies worldwide, there is going to be a huge

increase, demand for electrical power to fuel those expanding economies. We expect in DOE for electrical demand to increase worldwide by approximately double by 2030. And as Assistant Secretary Spurgeon said, the U.S. is pursing increased energy from diverse sources in ways that protect ad improve the environment and enhance our nation's energy security. Certainly, the nuclear option is one of those options that we are pursuing.

The NEPA process, this is why we are here tonight. Your public involvement is very, very crucial for us to make sure that we have a full record for a sound decision.

NEPA requires us to consider all the impacts of a proposed federal action, and it requires us to document that analysis in an environmental impact statement. Your input tonight will be considered in our analysis leading to a final record of decision that we expect in the summer -- whoops, excuse me.

Hold on. Anyway, how do I go back on this? Anyway, I will get back to this later.

In your materials, you will see that

along -- we are in the process now that, we are in a scoping process which is about a third of the way through the process. As Assistant Secretary Spurgeon says, we are really just at the start of this process. And we have a long ways to go, but we are contemplating a record of decision in June of 2008. And we are also considering what is considered to be a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, because of the broad range of considerations that the GNEP proposal has. It has numerous facilities at numerous possible sites and with domestic and international implications.

So it's a broad proposal that really compels a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. The purpose of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement is to assess some reasonable alternatives that encourage the expansion of nuclear energy production, reduces the nuclear proliferation risk and reduces the volume, the thermal output and the toxicity of spent fuel before disposal in the geologic repository.

The domestic programmatic alternatives that we will consider in the PEIS are two. One is what we call the no action alternative. We will

continue to recycle spent fuel or continue to go once through spent fuel management. Once through the reactor, store it on site, ultimately geologic repository. And this is what's being done now at 103 commercial reactors throughout the United States. But this alternative also includes a provision that we continue to do research and development on advanced fuel cycle, technologies like we are currently doing at several of our DOE national laboratories.

The other alternative that we are going to consider in the PEIS is the GNEP proposal. It's a broad implementation of a closed fuel cycle that could include one or more, one or more, nuclear fuel recycling centers and one or more advanced recycling reactors. With respect to the alternative, the GNEP proposal, DOE will conduct a project specific analysis to site, construct and operate any or all of the three GNEP fuel cycle facilities identified in the next two slides. So let me explain what these facilities are. Assistant Secretary Spurgeon said there are three of them that we are considering.

The first is the fuel recycling center.

This recycling center will separate spent fuel into the reusable uranium and transuranic elements. The transuranics are neptunium, plutonium, americium and curium. Those are the elements of uranium in the atomic charge. And also the recycling center will separate out the nonreusable constituents, the waste streams without separating pure plutonium. And we would not separate out plutonium for proliferation risk. Pure plutonium is a material that can be used for the development of nuclear weapons without further work on it. If we don't separate out pure plutonium, then ultimately more work has to be done on it to make it weapons grade.

The recycling center will also fabricate fuel for the advanced recycling center or advanced recycling reactor. The Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement will analyze alternative technologies for recycling. It will also analyze alternative spent fuel throughputs, anywhere from 100 to 300 metric tons annually.

The next facility in the GNEP proposal domestically is the advanced recycling reactor. This is a different technology reactor. It's different from the light water technology that is

currently in use in the 103 facilities. It will be designed to destroy the transuranics while at the same time generating electricity. The transuranics, by this process of going through this loop, will pretty much eliminate all of the transuranics, including plutonium. It will transmute it.

The proposed technology right now is a sodium cool fast reactor. We say this now and put it up as part of the slide, because we do have experience in sodium fast cool reactors in the United States at DOE sites. The PEIS will analyze alternative power range for this reactor, anywhere from 250 to 2,000 megawatts thermal. The footnote down there basically says that these two facilities, depending on the economic analysis of it and the technology analysis of these things could be privately owned and operated. And potentially with government supplied incentives or other involvement yet to be determined.

The last facility that is part of the GNEP proposal domestically is the research facility, advanced fuel cycle research facility. This will support research and development relating

to separation technologies, what is the most optimum separation technology to advance the goals of GNEP in terms of reducing waste and getting energy out of the spent fuel, and what is the best technology relating to the fabrication of fuel for the fast reactor.

It will also support long-term research and development for advanced fuel cycle technologies, and, as I mentioned earlier, Argonne National Lab is being considered as the site of this facility. It would be operated and built at a DOE site, such as Argonne.

Here is the following sites that will be assessed in the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement to determine potential locations. As you can see, the DOE sites that are under consideration are on the left-hand column. The non-DOE sites, such as Morris, Illinois, are on the right-hand side. We will use a screening to determine which sites may not reasonably support one or more of these facilities. There may be some site characteristics that do not lend themselves well to one or more of these facilities, and that particular site may be initially screened out. We

won't do any further analysis on that particular site.

And here is just a chart showing Morris, Illinois, second from the bottom, as well as Argonne in terms of what are the facilities that are potentially being analyzed for these locations. And here is another slide that displays at Argonne DOE facility, Morris non-DOE facilities and the facilities that could possibly be located there.

What are the international programs that are proposed under GNEP. We will work with partner nations. The partner nations are those nations now such as France, Britain, Russia, Japan, that have advanced nuclear technologies. We will work with these partner nations to have two types of programs.

One is a fuel services program, so for those developing nations that want to pursue the nuclear option for the generation of electricitity, we will work with those nations with our partner nations to assure the availability of fuel, under the proviso that they refrain from enrichment and reprocessing technologies. This is a proliferation thing, where the developing nation will refrain --

we will provide them fuel under a fuel management program. We will provide the fuel. We will provide the service to take the fuel from them when it is used.

There is also a reactor program in this international proposal as well. For those developing nations, like I said, that want to pursue the nuclear option, we will provide what is called safe, secure reactor. These will be right-sized reactors, small modular reactors, let's say ranging in the 300 to 500 megawatts electricity, right sized to meet their demands but with the spent fuel program will reduce the proliferation risk from them.

We are not proposing any specific action with regard to these international initiatives. We still need to work those out, but we will analyze these in a very broad qualitative way, the potential impacts to the U.S. or the common, global commons that might be involved with some of these activities on the international front.

In the PEIS, these are some of the environmental issues that we will be analyzing. You can see that some of them relate to human

health. Some of them relate to environment, some relate to socioeconomics and environmental justice, water, air, land impacts, community impacts, what have you. These are the ones that we will analyze. You may also bring up some issues that we haven't considered in your statements, in your statements tonight, and we will further analyze those if it makes sense.

Our record of decision will determine whether to proceed with the construction and operation of the GNEP recycling facilities, and, if so, we will address what technologies and capacities to utilize and the identification of qualified locations for one or more of those facilities.

DOE's decision will based on input from the PEIS, which also includes your statements, as well as other information that relate to cost studies that are ongoing, technical information, as well as policy considerations that have to be brought in to a decision of this magnitude.

How can you help us make a sound decision? You are here tonight. We love your involvement and your participation and taking time

out from your daily existence to come here and listen to us and provide comments. As I said, you may identify some reasonable alternatives to us as well as issues that we are not familiar with or aware of at this point.

Continue to be informed. Here is a website that, as I say, is full of good information. It is information rich. Stay tuned to that website as we go through this process. As we said, we are just at the beginning of this process. More information will come up on this website. You can stay involved and you can have -- maybe some of you have already signed up for the distribution list for the draft PEIS, but we will welcome your comments when that draft PEIS is issued, and we will consider your comments again as we develop the final PEIS, which will then support DOE's record of decision.

Here is how to provide your comments. You can do them tonight, oral or written. You can send U.S. -- comments through the U.S. mail to that address, e-mail to that address, telephone, fax. The comment period for this proposal ends April 4, 2007. So if you have things that you -- if you

have heard something tonight and you have further comments you want to generate later, you have written via e-mail, here is how you do it.

Once again, I thank you for your involvement, your participation, and we look forward to your comments and suggestions.

Thank you.

FROM THE FLOOR: Do you have the comment period now?

MR. BLACK: No, not now.

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): I am going to address that right now. I am going to get set up for taking your comments, and we will reconvene in about five or ten minutes. But there is an opportunity for you, if you do have some questions, Mr. Black and a few other staff people will be in the room behind us with some charts and drafts and so forth. If you have particular questions that you'd like to ask before you comment or whatever, you are certainly welcome to take this time to ask those questions.

In the meantime, we will get set up here. I will get the list of people who are going to speak. Let me just say a word about that,

because I haven't seen that list yet. I am hoping that we can allow at least five minutes for each person to speak. When I checked about a half hour ago, we had 16 people. I think we probably have many more than that at this point. So I have to use my judgment here to make sure that we keep it running. And so I am assuming it is going to be five minutes. If it is anything different than that, I will tell you when we reconvene.

You will be using this microphone over here, and I will go through all of the instructions, few as they are, when we reconvene. And if you have not signed up to speak and you would like to, please do this during this break.

Okay. We are going to break for about ten minutes, and I will let you know when we reconvene. Thank you.

(WHEREUPON, a recess was had.)

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): I would like to call the meeting to order. May I ask you to take your seats, please.

Okay. Thank you very much for your cooperation. I know a number of you have questions. I went in the back room a couple times,

and I could see there are many questions. I assume that we will have some time, if we take the people who are listed here, there probably will be time at the end for more questions. If you want to stay around and meet the people in the display area, you're certainly welcome to do it. It's a wonderful opportunity to meet these folks and also get the lowdown on the program that is being proposed.

At this time, we are going to take time to give you the opportunity to browse. Let's see. Where is this?

I guess it is possible that if you had some questions and you wanted to go you, you could do that, but right now I would like to get started on the formal comments on the scope of the proposed PEIS. Now, this is your opportunity to let DOE know what you would like to see addressed in the draft document.

A court reporter is here to transcribe your statements, and her name is Jackie Timmons, and she is to my left. As I often tell the court reporters, they are among the most important in the room, if not the most important, because they are

the ones who get the accurate record. So I will tell her to interrupt at any time if she is having trouble understanding or hearing what you have to say. Let me just review a few of the ground rules for the formal comments.

I would ask you to step forward to this microphone over here to my right when your name is called. Would you please introduce yourself, providing an organizational affiliation if it's appropriate. If there is anybody who is -- who would prefer not to come here, we do have a roving microphone that we can bring to your seat. So don't hesitate if I call your name and you would like to have that brought to your seat, please tell us.

If you have a written version of your statement, please provide a copy either to me or the court reporter after you have completed your remarks. Often people have formal comments written that exceed the amount of time that it takes to read them. So in those cases, I would ask you to summarize the written comments and hand them all in, because they are all included in the record.

Also, please give us any additional

attachments to your statements or references that you wish to have entered into the transcript. Each of these will be labelled and submitted for inclusion in the formal record.

Now, I will call at least two names at a time. The first is the speaker who is up at bat and the second person who is on deck. And sometimes I go to three just to make sure that everybody has fair warning. In view of the number of people who have indicated an interest in speaking, I ask you to confine your public statement to five minutes. I know -- I will get you know when you have one minute left in that by interrupting you as serenely as possible. At that point I would ask you to summarize your final comments as quickly but as gracefully as possible.

Mr. Black, again, will be serving as the hearing officer for the Department of Energy during the formal comment period. He will not be responding to any questions or comments during this session. People ask, well, if I do have questions. Any questions that you have, you can put on the statement as part of your comments and it will be included as part of the record. For tonight's

purpose, I consider those to be rhetorical questions but ones that will be addressed by the Department of Energy as they put forth their Programmatic Environmental Statement.

Okay. The first speaker that I have on my list is Scott Coren, and he will be followed by David Kraft and Corey Conn.

Is Scott Coren here? Great, Scott. Thanks.

MR. SCOTT COREN (City of Darien - Assistant to the City Administrator): Good evening. My name is Scott Coren, and I am here representing the City of Darien, Assistant to the City Administrator for the city of Darien.

My first comment would be that we are a little disappointed in the meeting schedule. We did want the meeting near the City of Darien, where city residents could attend. Tonight we did have a number of elected officials and residents that did want to attend but a 40-minute drive at this time of day was difficult for that to happen. We would have liked that near the City of Darien, and if we were looking for resident input and participation, we would have gotten a much better -- we would have

had more resident input if it was near city borders.

As to current project, we looked at the proposed sites for this. One of them was near Darien, Illinois; one of them was near Roswell, New Mexico, and one of them was near Idaho Falls. If you look at the population density of these different communities, Darien is two, sometimes three times the population density of these others. We don't understand why Darien and Morris were considered along with these other sites where there might have been less of an effect on local residents.

Our second comment is that we have been faced with transuranic waste at Argonne that we have been trying to get rid of for about five years. We have been dealing with Argonne to get rid of this. We have been unable to do so due to permitting transportation. I don't understand why, if we are trying to get rid of some of this, why Argonne is doing this and we're now looking to add more possible nuclear waste, more transuranic waste to this site. We don't want this on site. And putting this -- putting Darien residents further at

risk and would like to find out more information. We would like to invite you, if you'd like to, to come out to Darien, host another meeting, get more resident input if you would be willing to do so.

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Great. Thank you very much, Mr. Coren.

The next speaker is David Kraft, to be followed by Corey Conn and April Gerstung. And as Mr. Kraft is approaching the podium, I just want to remind you, I imagine half of you came in after I announced who I was. Since I am going to be here this evening, you should know, my name is Barry Lawson. I am not with DOE and I'm not associated with any party or any particular advocate for a position on this project. I just thought I should mention that to those of you who didn't hear about that earlier.

Mr. Kraft, please.

MR. DAVID KRAFT (Nuclear Energy Information Service): Thank you. My name is Dave Kraft. I am Director of Nuclear Energy Information Service based in Chicago. We are a nonprofit organization and a nuclear power watchdog group.

We have come here tonight to submit

comments to DOE in opposition to the GNEP proposal, and I will submit written comments and we will also provide embellished version of that before the April 4th deadline. But there are two broad areas and some specifics I want to raise before the public who came tonight.

Our two broad areas of concern about GNEP, first is the actual policy implications, both nationally and internationally, that reintroducing reprocessing creates. At a time in the world when we're trying to get nuclear weapons away from other nations, at a time when we are trying to repair our respectability in the negotiation field, we seem to be sending a mixed message by introducing reprocessing into the mix all of a sudden. What we're telling countries like Iran is, "Don't do as we say, do as we say." And that really doesn't fly well in the international community. We are already, in many sectors, viewed as bullies and as people who go it alone and just impose their will. We think reprocessing is a step backwards in terms of nuclear disarmament and in terms of putting the nuclear weapons genie back in the bottle. So that's the first broad policy statement.

More specifically, though, since we have been following nuclear power for 25 years, we object to bringing yet another piece of the nuclear infrastructure to the already overburdened State of Illinois. We have 14 reactors. We have the GEMO facility already. We thing that bringing this facility here adds an unnecessary risk.

I'd like to get into a couple of the specifics. I know some of the others will be mentioned by other representatives tonight. From a local concern, one of the unique features that we have to worry about here is the fact that they're talking about siting a facility within nine flight minutes of the world's busiest airport at O'Hare Field. This is of great significance after 9/11.

We already know that the nuclear reactors we have in Illinois are of questionable integrity in terms of their ability to resist an impact from a jetliner. We don't know that a reprocessing facility, which would be less reinforced, would have any -- would stand up any better, and we think that that absolutely must be addressed in your impact statement.

Now, the second thing is, we would also

request a specific, site specific facility analysis of any structures that you would propose that would hold radioactive materials on this site. If those facilities could not withstand the impact from an airliner, they don't belong not just in Illinois, they don't belong on planet Earth.

Another unique feature for Illinois is a pledge by the Department of Nuclear Safety historically to escort every single fuel shipment through, into and out of Illinois. If this facility is built, we're not just going to be talking about the waste from the 14 reactors here. We will end up as a regional facility and the costs and the environmental risks for this kind of a program would be prohibitive. We would like that addressed specifically in the EIS.

I want to go back just a moment to the policy angle and ask a rhetorical question. The only nuclear engineer we had as a President of the United States was Jimmy Carter, and he was the one that actually stopped reprocessing in the mid-1970s. We think his expertise should be respected, both in terms of his nuclear background and in terms of his foreign policy background as

President. The guy seems to know what he was talking about. He launched us along the road of deep geological repositories for waste disposal. We think that was a correct choice. It was just improperly handled by the Department of Energy for the last 30 years.

What we would suggest is that GNEP be abandoned and more resources be put into really solving the deep geologic burial problems that plagued Yucca Mountain.

And, finally, we would like specifically addressed the differences between the analysis that the Massachusetts Institute of Technology did in the year 2003 in promoting nuclear power, saying that the best thing we should do is a once-through cycle and not do reprocessing. We would really like to see a point/counter point analysis of their views and why they differ significantly from the policy that the DOE is undertaking.

I will stop there, and I thank you for your time. (Applause)

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Thank you, Mr. Kraft. I appreciate that.

Our next speaker is Corey Conn. He

would be followed by April Gerstung and Ken Daggett.

FROM THE FLOOR: Pardon me, is there a formal agenda for speakers?

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Yes, there is.

FROM THE FLOOR: I'm a former employee of Argonne National Laboratory who has intimate knowledge of this project. I have a paper I wrote in 1994, and I would like an opportunity to speak.

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): You will. Actually, if you will talk to the registration people out there, they will put your name right on the list. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Conn, to be followed by April Gerstung and Ken Daggett.

MR. COREY CONN: Good evening. My name is Corey Conn. I'm a concerned citizen and resident of Chicago. I did find it quite convenient to come by Metra and park by bicycle to attend this meeting. (Laughter)

Also, I have a printed copy of the comments I will share with you now. The recorder may be pleased.

Last March, Secretary Bodman asked for a

research and development budget of nearly $1 billion per year just to cover the assessment of the costs of the GNEP initiative. I would ask what portion of these GNEP R&D expenditures will actually go toward ensuring that safeguards, such as existing quality assurance codes and regulations, will be enforced?

How will enforcement vigilance compare to the gross laxity we've glimpsed in the manufacture of the Holtec dry storage casks now loaded at the Dresden Station?

Will modifications of the abandoned sodium-cooled breeder reactors actually test novel design changes beyond merely eliminating the plutonium-breeding uranium blanket?

How can the public be assured that some novel construction defect won't bring an experimental transuranic burner to a ruinous core melt like that suffered by the sodium-cooled Fermi reactor situated on the beach of Lake Erie?

It is absolutely proper to invoke the Great Lakes during the PEIS stage and to remind ourselves of the nuclear industry's reliance upon water generally, because the nuclear industry does

contaminate water routinely and has, at times, done so spectacularly. The Great Lakes containing, as they do, a fifth of the world's fresh liquid surface water, must not be subjected to international or interstate trafficking and irradiated fuel by way of barge, as might ultimately be needed to implement GNEP's transportation component. Nothing in the GNEP initiative strikes me as mitigating the array of hazards faced by the Great Lakes arising from the nuclear industry's routine operations or its permanent wastes -- rather the activities necessitated by GNEP could exacerbate these hazards by prematurely compelling a multimodal shipping campaign in support of an intermediate, nonfinal waste project.

The hypothetical waste technology envisioned by GNEP will increase the volume of nuclear waste and complicate its exclusion from the biosphere, will it not?

Rather than be presented with a compact array of bunkered dry storage containers, cooling quietly near the reactor sites, future generations would instead encounter yet another failed,

sprawling federal complex boasting a variety of atmospheric discharges and waterways and impoundments contaminated by solvents, chelating agents and radioactive sludges.

Were I to be among those future inhabitants of the Illinois River Valley, I would certainly prefer that gifts of permanent pollutants be left with their gift-wrap intact. GNEP proposes a wave of experimental profiteering through breaching of storage containers and the smashing of their contents. Were these merely the antiquities or cultural artifacts being looted, we should be sufficiently ashamed. But purely stretching the illusion of sustainability with this present money-grab threatens to make future generations pay with their health and the very habitability of their homes.

An industry which must dump the bulk of its true operating costs upon future generations is fiscally and morally fraudulent. Appropriations under the Energy Act, from which this initiative might draw further funds, should be subject to 100 percent rescission and funding in comparable amounts be instead directed toward wind farms,

conservation initiatives and public education.

Thank you. (Applause)

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Thank you, sir. Thank you, Mr. Conn.

Our next speaker is April Gerstung, and she would be followed by Ken Daggett and Jodi Dart.

MS. APRIL GERSTUNG: Hi. I'm just a regular person. No, I don't have an organization. You know, when I talk about this on the telephone or I'm sitting in front of my computer, I feel I have a real grasp of it, and the words that I have are intelligent. Right now I don't know. I'm just so frustrated.

I feel like all of this is selling the sizzle and not the steak, and I'm troubled by the conflicting stories that we get. We all have questions. I have lived in Morris since 1963. I come from a nuclear family. My father was a nuclear engineer. I worked the nuclear plants. The nuclear industry fed us, sent me to college, but I have a real hard time with the fact that now we have to decide where we want this, disposable nuclear energy to be, and I don't want it in my backyard. I'm surrounded by three nuclear plants

within a 25 mile radius. The GE plant is there. GE has been there, built in the late '60s, opened in the '70s, never operated because of technical problems, and I don't trust them.

At a meeting Tuesday night in Morris, Illinois -- and I am one of those that would have preferred this been a little closer, too, but -- a question was asked about transporting the spent fuel. Where was it going to come to this GE plant? And the person from GE said, "Just from within our area, just from in the State of Illinois."

After you spoke, I went out and spoke to one of the very nice ladies who said, "It's going to come from all over the United States." And I said, "Well, I'm having a problem." I want to know -- I want somebody to tell me the truth, and so we are conflicted.

My answer, bottom line is no, I don't want it in Morris, Illinois. I'm tired of being a guinea pig. I am tired of having my environment be problematic, and I'm tired of the unexplained illnesses, and I'm tired of just not feeling safe anymore.

So my answer is no, thank you. And

Argonne, also. Please take it somewhere else.

(Applause)

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Okay. Thank you.

I would like to call now on Ken Daggett, to be followed by Jodi Dart and then Sydney Baiman.

MR. KEN DAGGETT: Well, I also am a nobody, and I brought her. I am from Morris.

In this sheet that we were handed out, it says on the top of the sheet, it says, Advanced Notice of Intent was on March 2006. Now, notice of intent was given to the public in January of 2007. They had ten months to give the public notification that this was in the process. And it comes out, we have to have our comments in by April 4th, which is only giving us three months from when they were given okay to give the notification. It was published in the Morris paper on February 22nd, which gives us approximately five weeks to prepare any kind of a statement. You had ten months of -- well, you had 13 months, really, advanced notification that this was going to happen, but we only get five weeks and we have to reply. We have to make up our mind. It's not right. We weren't given enough notification.

And another thing, too, that I have a problem with is the time of the meetings, time and place of the meetings. Now, this is -- it took us 45 minutes to drive from Morris to get here. The plant is going to be located about 10 miles from Morris. Why do we have to come all the way up here to someplace that most people don't even know exists to come to a meeting on a Thursday night when we are all missing Survivor. (Laughter) It's the busiest, best night on TV and given a week's notice. We were only given a week's notice that this meeting was even going to take place. Anybody that has got any kind of a life at all has already got plans made a week in advance. We didn't get enough time for any kind of a presentation or even know what's going on.

Now, the only two, they were giving presentations, GE gave presentations at Coal City and Morris, which they put on a glorious display. They got a pretty girl up there and she was just smiling at everybody and pointing out all these different things, and they just ate it up. They think it's just fine, you know.

The administrator in Coal City said it's

a great deal, but what about the rest of us that live there and have got to put up with it? They don't say anything in the paper about everybody in opposition to it. And like she said, and like everybody else said, we don't want this in our backyard.

Well, okay, folks, everybody, and I am sure that you hear this every place you go, we don't want it on our backyard. Well, our backyard is full. We got plenty of this nuclear crap in our backyard, and we don't want anymore, especially when it comes in under the guise of research and it comes in under the radar and doesn't give anybody a chance to get any say-so into it.

We were given any number of different amounts of tons of fuel, spent fuel that's stored out there. We got 700 tons one place, 650 one place, 750 another. I don't know many tons that the average nuclear plant holds in this country and I don't have any clue what -- do you have any idea what is -- what an average plant would hold for nuclear fuel?

Okay. Let's give it 50 tons. Say every plant holds 50 tons and we have 700 tons out there.

Do we have the equivalent of 14 nuclear plants stored in that one building? They are just trying to fly in under the radar. It just doesn't make sense to me and we don't need it for sure.

Thank you. (Applause)

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Thank you.

The next speaker is Jodi Dart. She will be followed by Sydney Baiman and Scott Ackerman.

MS. JODI DART: Good evening, everybody. My name's Jodi Dart. I, too, am a lowly just a resident. I am representing myself as a lifelong resident of Illinois. I drove here from Springfield.

I am opposed to Illinois becoming a candidate for the GNEP facilities. Illinois is already home to more commercial nuclear reactors and the highly radioactive waste that they generate more than any other state in the nation. Reprocessing, as it has incorrectly called recycling, is actually the separation of uranium, plutonium and other elements from the spent nuclear fuel. The plutonium may then be used in a fresh -- used for fresh fuel for the reactors called plutonium fuel, however, none of the existing

reactors in the U.S. can burn-out the plutonium, which is one of the key goals of GNEP.

To destroy the plutonium would actually require an experimental type of reactor called a fast reactor, of which there are only three operating in the world today, and the history of fast reactors throughout the world has been marked by both safety and economic failures.

Reprocessing is extremely polluting, is expensive, and it undermines the global nonproliferation efforts. DOE claims that reprocessing will solve the growing nuclear waste problem, however, reprocessing will not preclude a need for a geologic repository. Of all the steps in nuclear chain, reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel has the highest routine air emissions and leaves large quantities of highly radioactive acidic liquid waste.

The proposed technologies under GNEP would separate weapons usable plutonium from high-level radioactive waste for reuse as nuclear fuel. However, plutonium constitutes only about 1 percent of high-level nuclear waste, so most of the radioactive poisons would remain as waste.

In addition, these messy processes create their own hazardous, radioactive and mixed waste streams that, as liquids and gases are even more difficult to manage than waste that has been left in the solid form. The legacy of past reprocessing in the United States is 100 million gallons of extremely poisonous waste that is currently stored in 243 leaking underground storage tanks that are currently threatening crucial water supplies.

I believe that Illinois should leave a more sensible legacy for our children, not a de facto nuclear waste dump that can harm the integrity of the environment and the water that they would someday consume.

Under GNEP, DOE would consolidate the nation's spent nuclear reactor fuel on one site, yet offers no storage options beyond what is already in use at existing sites, that is, pool storage and dry cask storage. DOE must consider in the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement all environmental, safety and security impacts from the indefinite storage of U.S. and global nuclear fuel and radioactive waste at all reprocessing

facilities.

In addition, DOE must provide detailed analysis of how the public and the workers at the GNEP facilities will be protected in the case of radioactive and nonradiological releases and waste streams that would result from reprocessing.

Should Illinois become the lead site for GNEP facilities, even more deadly radioactive waste, as April was alluding to, would be shipped into the state by road and rail. This would expose residents throughout Illinois, as well as those in other states across the country, to shipments of some of the most hazardous toxic waste in existence. The increased transportation of high level waste required under reprocessing would increase the probability of a transportation accident, exposing residents to deadly radioactive waste.

All impacts from transportation of fresh fuel, spent fuel and all GNEP waste streams, both in the U.S. and globally must be considered in the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement.

Another concern with GNEP is the threat of a terrorist attack or sabotage to all facilities

used for GNEP, risking the safety of our workers and the public at large. DOE should instead store all nuclear waste at the reactor sites in hardened, onsite storage and safeguard it from a terrorist attack. And being how Illinois has the most nuclear reactors in the country, it would be very important to safeguard them in our states.

Hardened onsite storage should be able to withstand most terrorist attacks without significant offsite releases. The Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement must analyze all impacts from a terrorist attack or sabotage on all GNEP facilities required for implementation.

There is also widespread concern about reprocessing in its environmental discharges and waste production. The main nuclear countries which reprocess spent fuel currently are the UK, France, Japan and Germany. Most of Europe's radioactive pollution comes from reprocessing plants and its pollution has been measured as far away as the West Coast of Greenland. Even the countries of Denmark, Iceland, Ireland and Norway face environmental and public health risks associated with the low level radioactive waste discharges into the ocean from

Britain's -- Britain and France's reprocessing plants.

There have also been clusters of childhood leukemia detected around the LaHague reprocessing plant in France. Moreover, in 1997, a study by the British Department of Health found traces of plutonium from the Sellafield reprocessing plant in the teeth of children throughout Britain. DOE must consider all health, economic and cultural impacts from all potential GNEP facilities, including reprocessing sites, fast reactors and spent fuel storage sites.

In addition, DOE must also consider impacts on vegetation and animal life of the region from all sites that will be affected by the GNEP facilities.

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): One minute, please.

MS. DART: Okay. I will wrap it up.

Commercial nuclear waste contains vast amounts of plutonium, and if separated through the reprocessing technologies, only a few kilograms is needed to build a nuclear bomb. And North Korea just recently demonstrated that by testing a nuclear weapon that it did produce from using the

plutonium it obtained through reprocessing. And as David had said earlier, I'm not sure where he is, but the United States cannot persuade other countries to forego reprocessing when we are pursuing it ourselves. And it would also undermine our obligation to the nuclear nonproliferation treaty, which is also already at risk of unraveling.

DOE must analyze in the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement the cost and impact of the increased threat to national security from leading exclusive international plutonium trade in which global tensions are increased and there is increased likelihood of plutonium being diverted or stolen.

In addition, DOE must consider the impacts to the nonproliferation treaty as the NPT is already, as again I said, in danger of unraveling.

Anyway, thank you for your time, and I have a written comment, too. (Applause)

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Thank you. Thank you very much.

Our next speaker is Sydney Baiman, to

be followed by Scott Ackerman and then Jerry Heinrich.

MS. SYDNEY BAIMAN (NEIS): I'm Sydney Baiman. I came down from Oak Park with Dave Kraft. For 35 years I have been trying to shut down nuclear power plants. We had an accident at Three Mile Island. Let's not forget that. We have had accidents all over the place. Nuclear power is not safe. Not any part of it is safe, and I resent the fact that the industry keeps using the word "clean." I would like to know what is clean about a typical, according to Dave Lockman, a typical nuclear power plant is 100-ton mix of uranium and plutonium fuel. The highly radioactive waste is stored on site. A 1,000 megawatt reactor contains as much long-lived, radioactive fall-out as would be produced by 1,000 Hiroshima sized bombs. I resent the fact that the word "clean" is always used, because they think that coal is dirty, because you see the smoke. But you must realize in the whole nuclear fuel cycle, from the mining, milling of uranium into first hexachloride and then into uranium pellets, coal and oil is being used.

Nuclear power is not a solution for

global warming. That's a ploy that's being used by the industry. And the other word I resent being used is "recycle," because recycle has an element of being environmental. Nuclear power is the most unenvironmental toxic carcinogenic, cancer causing deaths around the planet. It has caused so much suffering around Sellafield with the reprocessing, around Three Mile Island with the children. There was no such thing as a crib death, you know, a baby just dying out of no place until nuclear power happened. When Three Mile Island came along, the first crib deaths existed and, of course, England is full of crib deaths, because England is so radioactive with the transportation of the waste up to Sellafield where it is recycled and then most of that effluent, don't forget, any kind of recycling, any kind of taking apart the already highly radioactive fuel, which is a thousand times more radioactive than the pellets that were originally put in the plant, you're taking water to this and you're creating tanks and tanks of liquid, highly liquid, radioactive fuel. And what happens to this fuel? Well, I got news for you, folks. In Sellafield, most of it was dumped into the Irish

Sea. So the Irish hate Sellafield, because the northeast part of Ireland, there is an increase in Downs Syndrome, increases in Leukemia, because the sea is so radioactive.

If a child sits on a beach close to Sellafield, you can rest assured that child will die of Leukemia, and it has happened time and time again. You know, all this suffering from nuclear power does not get into the newspapers. You don't see the babies die, and you don't see people die of Leukemia and cancers, which -- this industry must be shut down and all this recycling is just giving a lot of people the big boys, the old boys club more jobs and it is a whole thing of jobs versus environment, but I'm certain we can go -- we don't need the energy. We are all -- we are all, what is it, conserving our energy. We are learning -- I only heat one room in my house, because ComEd has raised the rates. You know, we have 14 nuclear power plants in Illinois and the rates are going up, up, up. How can we stop ComEd, it's so powerful? We have to do alternative. We have to have solar, wind. We don't need all this nuclear energy. There is plenty of ways for us to get

warm. Just use one room, the way I do, because I refuse to pay ComEdison all that -- ComEd or whatever its name is. Now, it's Exxon. Like they all have Ex in front of them. All these companies, they are uniting, they are Exelon.

Anyway, I think I said enough, but we must shut down the whole industry. Thanks.

(Applause)

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Thank you.

Scott Ackerman, then Jerry Heinrich and Bruce Renwick.

MR. SCOTT ACKERMAN: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I think I am going to break a trend here. I'm a resident of Braidwood, Illinois. I moved to the area about seven years ago for employment, and it was an employment in the nuclear field. I didn't have any reservations about working in this line of employment. I didn't have any reservations moving to Braidwood. It was one of the areas my wife and I choice based on the fact that the real estate prices were low and the taxes were low in the area, and I think that's a reflection of the industry that's in the area, as well.

I'd like to first say that I support the GNEP initiative based on the fact that we need to reduce the amount of waste that we have currently. You can call it recycling, call it reprocessing, however you'd like to phrase it. The fact of the matter is, the geological repository has been in a state of upheaval and indecision for several years until we act and do something with the fuel that we have around, we will continue to add to the problem.

Everybody's mentioned time and time again how many sites we have in Illinois. We have mentioned the number of reactors in the United States, and they're all currently operating. So with that, we have to handle the waste that's being produced.

The GNEP alternatives have their pros and their cons. Some suggestions that I would like to make, that GNEP would consider, would be more money for education. We need to support new technological development. We need to support kids coming through school, if it be in the form of scholarships or grants to the schools to find new technology. What hasn't been brought out here is

the fact that nuclear technology and the plants that are currently operating today providing electricity, more than most likely for this room, are based on a 50-year old technology. The decision that was made to not reprocess approximately 30 years ago was made on 30-year old technology. I can remember as a kid having a Commodore 64 computer, and today I think my cell phone has a hundred times the memory of that particular computer.

So with the advances in technology, it would be silly for us to not at least investigate some of these courses. Do I think it's the only solution? No. But do I think it is a viable solution to what we are currently facing today with the stockpiles of used fuel for the last 50 or so years? Yes. And I encourage everybody to support at least some form of reduction of the waste. If it is in the form of reprocessing, then so be it, but we need to address the issue and we need to address it now, so that we don't leave legacy for our children. Thank you. (Applause)

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Thank you.

I'd like to call now Jerry Heinrich and

then be followed by Bruce Renwick and Keith Harley.

MR. JERRY HEINRICH (Sauk Calumet Group - Sierra Club): Good evening. My name's Jerry Heinrich. I live in Wilmington, Illinois. I live basically 4 miles from Braidwood, 13 miles from Dresden, 13 miles from GE plant and I worked for 31 years next to Dresden Nuclear Power station, so I guess you could call me not a NIMBY, but I'll probably end up sounding like one here tonight.

One of my concerns is -- well, first of all, I should introduce, I am with the Sauk Calumet Group of the Sierra Club and represent quite a few of their views here tonight. One of our concerns is this program has to be one of the world's best kept secrets coming out of the government, because the chapter of the Sierra Club, Illinois Chapter Sierra Club, had no knowledge of this coming up until literally four days ago, and that was provided by some of the people here in this room, so I am trying to find out why the timeline was started in 2006 wasn't more widespread and more knowledgeable to more people, particularly in this particular area which it affects.

One of the things I want to address is

the obvious. This proposal has selected sites that are in the midst of growing and already congested areas, upwind of greater Chicagoland and 7 million people, upwind of Lake Michigan, up river of St. Louis, Memphis, New Orleans. The Morris plant, the GE plant is right on the river within a few -- well, less than a quarter mile. Access to the proposed locations is not limited to major interstates, I-80, I-55, I-294, the Illinois River, Des Plaines River, I-88, and soon the Prairieland Expressway, or whatever it is going to be called. The GE Morris plant is very close to large traffic, multiple railroads, center point intermodal, O'Hare, Midway. We have plenty of targets in these, and we are not limited to those I just mentioned. There is also the Hancock Building, Sears Tower, Argonne, soon to the Northern Santa Fe intermodal facilities coming in within a few miles of the Morris plant.

The nuke plants in the area, we have already four of them, so, you know, living where I live, we have time to adjust to living with the nuclear power plants, but with the advent of 9/11, we haven't adjusted fully to the idea of living

with the nuclear power plants and all these other targets in this particular area.

So, to me, it's like, what would Mr. Spock and Star Wars have said, is this a logical thing to do? With all these targets and all these situations, there has to be a better place to put it than upwind of Chicagoland all these other sites I just mentioned.

I would also ask this group to consider that, basically, it's just from wind blowing. If something would happen to Dresden or GE plant, with 30 mile an hour wind, it will take 30 minutes to impact downtown Chicago, the perimeter of Chicagoland. With the same 30 mile an hour wind, it will be 60 minutes and be impacting downtown Chicago. This isn't time for addressing anything. This is something that nobody can address. If it happens, it happens. No evaluation process will allow for this.

There was a lot of studies and safety concerns that revolved around Yucca Mountain. Some of it was good ideas, some of it was delaying tactics, I suspect, but at the same time, these type of studies need to be gone through and

anything that might be relevant to this type of proposal here needs to be brought up, not by the people, but by the people who are proposing this. They have these documents. They need to take a look at them. Why did it take so long for Yucca Mountain to move to the point at which it is at? Or the real question is, why did it take so long and why is it not?

So please also take into consideration, Homeland Security and 9/11 plans and action. This is an industrial area in Joliet. Right now they put in plans where you have a difficult time trying to cross Dresden locks. There is a dam there. Took out the railway into the GE storage area and cemented it in. They mandated the industrial plant and precautions. My favorite after 9/11 was to protect the GE plant and Dresden. They took a little jeep with a rocket launcher in the back and drove around Goose Lake Prairie and around GE plant. Well, that was real smart. All you have to do is hit the guy over the hand and take the rocket launcher and shoot it at the plant. I mean, this was not good planning, in my opinion. And it bothers me when I see things like this happen.

So this is why I'm still concerned that I don't know if we're ready to move forward with a project like this with the way we act. How good is our national security? Well, truthfully, are we to believe that the federal government currently believes in the intelligence it provided the FBI and CIA in Homeland Security. We look at this on television. We don't see that they are in agreement that the intelligence is any good, and they obviously take some opposite action of what the intelligence says.

Joliet hasn't emerged from the last fiasco concerning processing uranium. Over 55 years ago, Blockson Chemical, Olin Chemical, some of you people might have worked at this plant. There were some complications. Fifty-five years later, we're still trying to figure out what to do with the gypsum, possible gypsum piles having to do with the people who work there who got complicated. They are going to die before it is resolved. This is our government's way of dealing with nuclear problems in the past. I haven't seen anything that indicates they are going to do any better in the future.

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): One minute, please.

MR. HEINRICH: Okay. For six years we have been told the potential for worldwide terrorism, told about the potential for worldwide terrorism. What I would like to know is how does this proposal mitigate the potential for local terrorism? Are we to assume we are winning the Iraq -- winning in Iraq and terrorism is no longer a threat? Because to produce or move forward with a proposal like this, almost you have to assume we're doing something good or maybe we're not.

Thank you. (Applause)

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Thank you.

Bruce Renwick, Keith Harley and then Bridget Rorem.

MR. BRUCE RENWICK: Good evening. I am here to represent myself. I have three or four technical things I would like to have included in the environmental statement. First, Jerry talked about proximity to Chicago Metro region. Also, the fact that that area, southwest Chicago Metro is the fastest growing area. If you look around Manhattan and even in the Morris area, you are starting to see a lot of development and west of Joliet into

Kendall County.

The other piece Jerry also mentioned is the proximity to the Illinois River and the Mississippi River basin. We've had problems in the past with certain contaminants reaching into the water tables and in this area from nuclear power plants. I know they're getting cleaned up. I know they are a lot shorter lived than some of this will be.

The next issue is there is a Sandwich fault. It taken into account when they built Dresden Nuclear Power Plant, but it is there. It sits under that area, and it's active. It had a movement a few years ago.

I guess the last issue I have got is, until we get a geological storage facility, a/k/a Yucca Mountain, the nonusable waste will need to sit someplace. And I have a feeling it is going to sit in this facility. So I'm a little concerned that we haven't been able to get Yucca Mountain in, the geological facility, and everything that this has spoken to says that, "Oh, don't worry, we will recycle this, we'll take some of the transuranic waste. It will go off to sodium breeder reactors,

which were worked on several years ago by a consortium of utilities and the government and then dropped as impractical. But the other waste, the nonusable waste, is going to sit out there, and as Jerry points out, that's also an issue because there are such things as not nuclear weapons, but also dirty bombs, and we're heard a lot from the government about the need to protect ourselves from dirty bombs and that's just a certain amount of atomic waste wrapped up with a certain amount of TNT.

Thank you very much.

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Thank you, sir. (Applause)

All right. Our next speaker is Keith Harley and it will be followed by Bridget Rorem and Bill Gerrish.

MR. KEITH HARLEY (Chicago Environmental Law Clinic): Mr. Hearing Officer, ladies and gentlemen, good evening. I'm an attorney. I'm an attorney at an organization called the Chicago Legal Clinic. I was asked to be here tonight on behalf of a group called Citizens Against Ruining the Environment. They are residents who live in

Will County. And the nuclear energy information service, Mr. Hearing Officer, in evaluating the alternative locations, there should be one decisive factor for the Department of Energy. You must choose an alternative that minimizes human health impacts of routine and accidental releases of radioactive material. In other words, you should choose a location where there are the fewest potential human receptors of direct and indirect exposure to radiation. In other words, you should not choose a location which is near an urban area. It should not require transportation of materials by rails, by truck, through densely populated urban areas. The facility location should not be upwind of a densely populated region.

It should not be in an area where population growth is occurring rapidly, as it is in Morris. It should not be in an area where there is a potential for profound agricultural impacts. If there is a release, routine or accidental, and the wind is not blowing toward Chicago, it will be blowing toward agricultural resources that could lead to a current loss, through the contamination of crops and livestock, it could lead to the

permanent loss of farming capacity. It should not be in an area that is dependent on nearby groundwater or surface water resources for drinking water supplies. It should not be near a major source of regional fresh water for drinking water, the Great Lakes.

Mr. Hearing Officer, it is also important that the location that you choose have the infrastructure to prevent and respond to accidental releases. A private facility has an inherent disadvantage in being able to provide site security by comparison to a government location. A private facility has an inherent disadvantage in possessing the capacity for emergency response and for controlling emergency response by comparison to a public facility.

Finally, Mr. Hearing Officer, it is very important that you pragmatically choose a location where you will face the fewest potential legal and political impediments.

The facility in Morris would face predictable legal and political roadblocks by citizens, politicians and units of state and local governments, including challenges of political

activities after you have committed significant public resources.

I am not GE. I don't have much of an ego imagination, but it is very easy for me to foresee years, decades, legal challenges, political activities. I don't believe that Morris is a battle that you want to fight.

Thank you very much. (Applause)

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Thank you.

Our next speaker is Bridget Rorem, who will be followed by Bill Gerrish and Mary Pat.

MS. BRIDGET ROREM: Hello. I'm Bridget Rorem. I currently live in Kankakee. Until two months ago, I lived in Essex, Illinois. I have for nearly 30 years been involved with the issue of what is now called GEMO but was currently previously known as the GE Morris spent fuel operation. And I should mention that I have, over this time, at various times, worked for and with various environmental organizations and peace organizations, including Appleseed, Greenpeace, Friends of the Earth and the American Friends Service Committee. For decades, since the beginning of the atoms for peace program in the

1050s, the nuclear industry and the government have been promising a solution to the problem of final disposal of spent nuclear fuel. We have yet to see such a solution implemented.

I would like to know what have been so far the costs of containing, treating and otherwise storing nuclear wastes. What are the long-term costs projected to be? What studies have been done on this and who paid for any such studies? Inasmuch as neither the nuclear industry nor the government has actually found a verifiable solution to the problem of such storage, and given that many of the byproducts of nuclear power need to be isolated in storage from humans and as much of the environment as possible for hundreds of thousands of years, might it well not be the case that the costs of storage may overwhelm the original gains from nuclear power? Does not the continued use of nuclear energy and the continued and unfounded belief that it is a safe source of energy give a reason for unstable governments to claim that they need to enrich uranium for nuclear power generation, even as we may fear and suspect that they are doing so in order to create nuclear

weapons? North Korea certainly claimed this. Iran currently is doing so. This is a sad side effect of the poorly named Atoms for Peace Program begun in the 1950s.

The sale of reactor parts, technology and fuel, is fraught with uncertainty. In 1978, General Electric was under contract to build 12 large nuclear reactors in Iran. The revolution in Iran in 1979 made the plan unfeasible. I assume that the costs of any accidents or mishaps will be only minimally covered by insurance per the Price-Anderson Act. What assessments have you done on the projected costs of accidents of transportation of spent nuclear fuel, reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel, transportation of completed products from the facility and containment of nuclear waste at the facility? What assessments are you planning to do?

The premise of GNEP is that nuclear energy is necessary. I challenge that assumption and ask that we see in your analysis real cost benefit considerations of the long-term costs. Nuclear energy is a solution to neither oil dependence nor global warming. It is far more

expensive, I would venture to guess, than other sources of power if one considers the long-term expenditures which are required for containing waste products.

Finally, a strong theme runs in communities which have housed nuclear facilities over the last 50 years. If it is nuclear, it will leak. (Applause)

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Thank you very much.

Our next speaker is Bill Gerrish, to be followed by Mary Pat Holtschlag and then Gerd Rosenbaum.

MR. BILL GERRISH: Good evening, everybody. I am here as one of the few people who are speaking in favor of this project. I'm a carpenter; I'm a business agent. I'm concerned with the working family and the working man, and I look at this differently than a lot of people that have already spoke here tonight. I look at it as a huge opportunity to get work in a county that is consistently at the highest level in the State on unemployment. I see it as an opportunity for a large number of jobs. I don't want to sacrifice

safety for jobs, but I will say this, from the information I have gotten, there -- if this plant was to go through, there would be approximately 2,000 jobs, construction jobs for five years, which means a lot of money, a lot of economical opportunity for the county, a lot of relief on taxes from the tax money we would receive from this plant. And after construction is all completed in that and all these jobs have finished, there will be 400 permanent employees at this plant, plus all the maintenance that comes along with it every year.

I have worked at a nuke plant. I can consider it to be safe. I know that the NRC is a government body that is there to control the safety of the public and all the workers in the facility. We have got a lot of nukes around us. We've got a lot of spent fuel that is stored that people don't even know about around here.

The way I look at this is, they're looking for a way to get rid of this spent fuel. Through this process we will be eliminating a lot of the stuff that is already stored in our backyard that we don't ever talk about. To me, it's a great

opportunity to put people to work. All these young people that are not able to afford college or are not college bound need a place to work. Construction is big in Grundy County and Will County and the surrounding areas because of growth. We have the best waterways and the best railways and the best highways for opportunity for industry and industrial stuff, and that is probably what 50 to, I don't know, this is not a proven stat, but I'd say at least 50 percent of the young people that do not attend college is going into the construction field. And it is a great opportunity to supply jobs under the conditions that these people here can prove to us that this is safe, that this is actually reducing the waste in the area. And the NRC, I know, will regulate this and watch this, and we've got plants. Dresden is one of the oldest plants. We have had no accidents. I don't even think that they have, have we? Well, I assume that this young lady knows more than me about it, but I know that they are monitored heavily. I worked out there for years, and I know that with the new technology and the new restrictions and the threat of terrorism and everything that goes with

it, that before they would even consider going forward with this project, they would -- they would definitely make sure that they have over safety-tized this place and overspent money to do the research that this is a safe project. And it is good for the community and it is going to reduce the amount of waste that is stored around here. And as far as transportation of fuel, I know that fuel has to be brought in to all these power plants and spent fuel has to be brought out of all these power plants. I have never heard or seen anything in the paper until recently of people complaining about that. I haven't heard of any accidents. I know they put these spent fuel in these big casks. They are very safe in travel, and I am sure that all the research and that will be done. Before they would even put a shovel in the ground, they would make sure there is no danger to the public.

Sure, there is always a chance of accidents. There is a chance a tornado will hit sometime soon here. We have no control over that. But these people have control to make this thing safe. We need to get rid of this spent fuel. We need the jobs. Grundy County and surrounding

counties need the work. It is a great opportunity to improve our economics and our tax base revenue around here, which everybody knows how high the taxes are and this is a great opportunity to give us some relief there and also put food on the tables of the working men.

Thank you for your time.

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Thank you.

(Applause)

Our next speaker will be Mary Pat Holtschlag, Pat Holtschlag, Gerd Rosenbaum and David Pointer. And before you begin, I would just like to say that it is now 10 minutes of 8:00 by my clock. I would like to have a short break at 8:15. As you can see, the court reporter is working busily. By then she will have been an hour and a half straight just on comments, so I would like to give her a five-minute break. So I would like to announce that ahead of time so that wherever it falls in the speaking, you don't think I am picking on somebody. I'm not.

Please.

MS. MARY PAT HOLTSCHLAG (Prairie Streams): My name is Mary Pat Holtschlag, and I'm the chair of a

local watershed initiative called Prairie Streams. It's located in Will County, Illinois, and we represent four creeks in rapidly urbanizing areas, one, Forked, Grant, Jackson and Prairie Creek.

Now, while neither -- none of these creeks are in the Grundy County area, they do feed into the Kankakee and the Des Plaines, which the confluence of those two rivers forms the Illinois. So our comments tonight, my comment tonight is strictly going to be about water. There is a lot of things that I'd like to say, but as chair of Prairie Streams, I am going to be sticking to this topic.

We have -- we are part of the Prairie Partnership, and we also have grants through the National Fish and Wildlife Fund. That is via the Open Lands Project.

Thanks for giving us this opportunity to speak, but one of the things that we have concerns over, of course, are the water use, how much water is going to be used, how it is going to be sent back into the hydrological cycle, what that water is going to contain once it gets back into the hydrological cycle, how many people, if there was a

catastrophic event, would be subject to either drinking water that had been contaminated. We have all had our issues with tritium, and that seems to be like a really small component. We are going to be looking at cesium, strontium, plutonium, and we have a lot of -- lot of concerns. And while your chart recognizes some of the geological issues, we really feel that water, since it is a big component of these big reactors, should be something that you go into a little more depth on.

Another issue, of course, would be soil types. Most of the river areas, and I'm not exactly sure where you are even talking about putting this plant, but the soil types are going to be really important, because they could just leach things right back into the water.

The other issue that we have is, it sounds like this is actually at some point going to be a storage facility, since the actual technology doesn't seem to be ready to take care of some of these issues to take care of these nuclear products. I mean, it seems like the fast reactors, at least on your website, when I click on "advanced reactor" under the "glossary," I get a notice that

says "page not found." And that happens a couple of times on your website.

So we're having some issues just getting information. I mean quantity of water, all those things are important to us.

One of the other issues that we have is that it sounds as though, and I think you reiterated this, is that these could be privately owned. And we have some issues with transparency at that point. Because these are nuclear facilities, they are going to be -- they may be able to not give us all the information that we need concerning NPDS storm water issues and all those things, and they are going to claim that that information, that they don't have to give that to us. So we have some issues there, too.

I guess the last thing that I really have to say here, is that, you know, you guys are spinning this. You're spinning the whole thing. The website is a big spin. Let it either sink or float on its own merits. I mean, all the people here, we're smart enough to know that, you know, the little dancing animals in the rain forest, I'm a sucker for musicals just like anybody else, but

we would really like to see hard science. We would like to see the answers and we'd like to see them in a timely fashion, rather until this thing is built and we're close to it. So thanks very much.

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Sir, please. Would you sit down, please. You will have your opportunity as everybody else.

FROM THE FLOOR: I am afraid everybody will be gone by the time --

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): No, everybody -- well, no --

FROM THE FLOOR: I have a technical report.

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): I'm sorry. Please sit down. I am going to have to ask you to sit down, please. Everybody will wait their turn. I'm sorry, Ms. Holtschlag.

MS. HOLTSCHLAG: That's okay. I'm just about finished anyway. You know, one of the things that one of the gentlemen that came up here prior to me was. He talked about jobs. And that is something that our group is concerned about. I mean, we have to look at the cost benefit ratio here. We have to see what this actually does for the communities. And, like I said, it is either going to float or

it's going to sink, but give us the facts. Don't sugar coat it. We live in the Midwest. We can handle it. Thanks so much. (Applause)

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Our next speaker is Gerd Rosenbaum, to be followed by David Pointer and Mark Peters.

MR. GERD ROSENBAUM: My name is Gerd Rosenbaum. I'm living in Lemont, close enough to the Sanitary Ship Canal and plenty of railroads through which the stuff will roll in to be concerned. I'm a physicist by education, not a nuclear physicist, though, so I'm not competent to comment on the feasibility of the plutonium and the fast breeder, recycling fast breeder reactor.

I'm designing and building large scientific equipment. I always was envious of the reactor engineers and scientists over there by the clapping, that they, after spending 50 years and having solved the basic problems of material, degradation of the fuel rods in the reactor, but they still can straight face and have a living. I would have been fired if I don't solve my problems after three-years. (Applause)

Now, they present and promise us the

fast breeder reactor. In ten years and that has been stopped for reasons, and that will be picked up in ten years, we get another one. It sounds like this fat abdomen syndrome. Every time after reconciliation, "Oh, honey, this time, it will be better." (Laughter) No, it won't. Basic problems need to be solved first. I would like to come to one we all know, that all the stuff which comes in comes through the waterways, Great Lakes, from other places, not what is stored here. All our railroads all go through the Sanitary Ship Canal right to Morris, right? Great location for that. Over railroads, which all go, because Chicago they all have to go through the densely populated areas. The streets -- the roads, the interstates all go all around the lake, the stranger, I-80. Everybody knows that, prone to accidents. I'm not talking about people have talked about the terrorists, just sheer accident. And I would like to put a little perspective on the danger of plutonium. Plutonium is -- and that's only one. Plutonium is an extremely toxic material, because it accumulates in the organs, in the bone, radiates an alpha remitter as it sits close in the bones to the bone marrow

and has tremendous health effects. And there's a reason why. EPA, I went to the website, like we all do, and looked up what is the limit for alpha emitter contaminations of drinking water. It's 15 picocuries, and I did my math. And a physicist may not know much, but we do pretty good in math, so I did my calculation here and came out with, that at 1 gram plutonium, 239, and that is -- 1 gram is an eighth of an inch cube. That's 1 gram. It contaminates about four times ten to the 9 liter water, you convert this, it is 3,200-foot acre of water, to that limit of safe drinking water. Whatever -- this is EPA clear. One gram plutonium 238, which has a shorter lifetime activity, would contaminate 800,000-foot acre of water. One little gram. And you have to put it in perspective, a 100 megabyte reactor, I got this from Federation of Scientists, they -- American scientists at the SEM, produce 100 gram plutonium per day, a hundred megabyte. And that is not the biggest one. The bigger are -- the world's nuclear power produced 200,000 -- 200 tons of plutonium a year. By 1982, it was 300 tons has accumulated.

I extrapolated to 2006. It would be 800 tons. 1,000 -- this is one billion times 1 gram. If that tiny amount goes, it contaminates 1 foot high of 3,000 acres. One foot high. That is 3,000-foot acre of water. It is enormous.

So planning to have that in this densely populated area, this site is only the greed of GE. I wasn't asked and agreed that this was a good place as they claim, and they don't give us the answer who, who on earth except for people who -- well, they have reason to look for the employment. I agree with that, but not at that price. And I think this is the worst site you can look at. Only for that argument. I'm not talking about the other. It has been talked about enough. Thank you. (Applause)

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Thank you.

Okay. David Pointer. He will be followed by Mark Peters and Lorna Paisley.

MR. DAVID POINTER (North American Young Generation in Nuclear): Good evening. As President of the North American Young Generation in Nuclear, and on behalf of our 2500 plus members across North America, I'd first like to thank all

of you in this room for participating in this very important process that's really a demonstration of the best of our democracy at work.

I'd like to start by saying that nuclear energy provides a clean, safe, reliable and economical means of meeting our energy needs now and well into the future, while addressing global climate change. Dr. James Lovelock, creator of the Gaia theory, has led to the -- in all of the investigations of global climate change to-date. Patrick Moore, the founder of Greenpeace, Stewart Brand, the founder and editor of the Whole Earth catalog, all currently support the expansion of nuclear power to address this greatest challenge that mankind has addressed today.

Nuclear power is part of a balanced energy mix. It enables new technology in industry. It promotes economic growth and helps maintain our standard of living across the country and especially here in Illinois where over 80 percent of our electricity is generated by the State's nuclear plants on a typical day.

The implementation of the immense fuel cycle capability envisioned in GNEP enables us to

use precious natural resources in a responsible manner as sufficiently as possible and reduce the technological challenges associated with permanent repository development. Coupled with developments in renewable energy and efforts to improve conservation, the GNEP program promises to provide an opportunity to accept responsibility for ensuring that abundant energy is available not only to our generation, but to our children, our children's children and their children. We look forward to continuing to participate in this process, this public process, as the PEIS is developed and as the GNEP program goes forward to help ensure that these facilities live up to the GNEP vision in a safe, secure and responsible manner and become a great asset to all of us who live here in Illinois.

Thank you very much. (Applause)

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Thank you.

Okay. The next speaker is Mark Peters to be followed by Lorna Paisley and Floyd Dunn.

MR. MARK PETERS (Argonne National Laboratory): Good Evening. My name is mark Peters. I work at Argonne National Laboratory. I'm a scientist and

also the deputy to the associate lab director for applied science and technology.

My colleagues and I are here tonight to first listen to your concerns, your real legitimate concerns and also state that public safety is paramount, priority one. That hopefully goes without saying. But I want to talk a little bit about our future and then a little bit more about GNEP.

The DOE representative talked at the beginning about energy demand and other challenges that we face. Some of the sobering things I look at on a daily basis about the energy demand that we expect to be facing in the U.S. and with the competition from China and India, for example, and also the challenges of global climate change, greenhouse gas emissions, we don't have a lot of time for solutions. We need to start working on the R&D now to do those solutions, to create those solutions. And there is no single solution. I am not going to sit here and say, "I've got the answer." It's going to require efficiency and conservation. That was mentioned. It's going to require solar, it's going to require wind, it's

going to require biofields and, yes, it will require nuclear energy.

We're working on R&D in many of these advanced energy technologies at Argonne. One of those is advanced nuclear energy systems, advanced reactor design, as well as advanced nuclear fuel cycles. We have been working on those areas for decades. A lot of these technologies were actually born, bread and invented at Argonne National Laboratory and we continue to work on those programs for the Department of Energy.

The current program that's being discussed tonight, the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership, is the most recent program that the department is running to develop these advanced nuclear energy systems. And we at Argonne will play a strong technical leadership role in the R&D associated with conducting GNEP. And we hope to continue to play that strong role for the future.

One of the challenges that we face in conducting that R&D mission, is twofold. It's first, people, smart scientists and engineers to do the work, particularly in the nuclear field. We've got an again workforce, so we really are working

real hard to bring in young people into the field to develop these advanced nuclear energy systems. That requires R&D facilities, and one of the proposed facilities that is being discussed tonight is, in fact, that advanced fuel cycle, R&D facility. That's absolutely essential to be able to meet the R&D mission that's been set out in front of us.

So I'd like to stop there, but I'd like to close with where I started. Your concerns are real legitimate. My colleagues and I are here tonight to hear those concerns. We have been working in this community for decades. We've worked closely with the community. We feel like we've been open and provided information as requested and addressed concerns, and we intend to do so as this program progresses.

Thank you very much. (Applause)

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Thank you.

Lorna Paisley, to be followed by Floyd Dunn, after which we will take a very short break.

MS. LORNA PAISLEY: I think I came here tonight to be more educated. I do know something about nuclear, and I feel like it must have a

purpose here. It should be able to be used in -- be used safely some way. I don't know enough about the formation of plutonium to know about the waste -- you know, the waste products that will be formed. I am anxious to hear the rest of the speakers, but I do have some questions, I guess.

People need to be educated about nuclear. I think a lot of people don't know too much about it, though I'm sure those people probably are not sitting here tonight. I do think that if they build these plants, anybody who works there needs to have a breathalyzer test taken every day before they go to work and a drug test, because I used to bartend a long time ago when they were building Braidwood, and I know that my clients that came into that bar were not sober when they left there, and I don't know how in the world they went to work and did a decent job. To me, that's like the scary part. It may sound kind of funny, but I don't think it is.

I think I have a bigger problem with trusting the government than I do trusting the dangers of nuclear energy. What guarantees will we have that this plutonium won't be used to make

nuclear weapons. If there are negative consequences to the people, will the people be informed about it, or will it be something like what happened in Ottawa with the watch plant out there, where the ladies used the radium and then when they started to limp, they were fired?

Will our water system be kept clean? Will there eventually be some trillion dollar clean-up, like some Superfund needed, like what happens sometimes with nuclear waste. And where will this waste go? I would like to know that. So I have a lot of questions that need to be answered, and I probably don't feel any more certain about anything now than when I -- I probably feel less certain, actually, about how safe this all is, than when I walked in the door, but I am still willing to learn and listen to the rest of the speakers.

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Thank you very much. (Applause)

Floyd Dunn.

MR. FLOYD DUNN (American Nuclear Society): My name is Floyd Dunn. I'm a resident of Downers Grove and a member of the American Nuclear Society. First, I'd like to thank the DOE for the good

presentation they made tonight.

Second, I'd like to point out that recycling is by far the best way to dispose of spent nuclear fuel.

One thing that has not been brought up is if you take, use -- went through cycle in a nuclear plant, the spent fuel is highly radioactive for tons of thousands or hundreds of thousands of years. Now, if you recycle and fission the fissionable materials, you are still going to have to put fission products in Yucca Mountain or something like that. But they will only be highly radioactive for about 300 years, so you made a huge difference for future generations.

Also, I'd like to point out that for a -- from the point of view of the electrical utilities, the only real alternative to nuclear is coal. Currently over 50 percent of the electricity made in U.S. is made by burning coal, about 20 percent by nuclear, about 10 percent by hydro and almost all the rest is by burning either natural gas or oil. And actually hydro is a very good way to make electricity, but in the U.S. now it is almost impossible to build a new dam.

Wind is often, you know, talked about as a way of the future. The wind is hugely expensive, if the only source of electricity are the main source. It requires storage when the wind not blowing and that costs usually more than the windmills themselves. If you are looking at this from the point of view of the utility, state regulators are not going to allow you to pass the extra cost of the wind system on to the consumers. There is already a lot of outroar, uproar about Commonwealth Edison raising their rates 20 percent and it will require a lot more than that for wind power. Now, utilities will build wind power systems if they're heavily subsidized, otherwise, they'll use core nuclear. They will also burn oil or natural gas if it's cheap, but right now it is not at all cheap.

So, as I said, the only real alternative to nuclear is coal, because coal and nuclear are the cheapest alternatives for the utilities.

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Thank you, sir.

(Applause)

We're going to take a short break.

Before we do, I have a couple of announcements. First of all, I'm terribly impressed. You have been very respectful of both sides of the issue, and for a large crowd, not that I didn't expect it here, but I really appreciate that, and I think everyone else does, as well.

I have at least seven people on my list here and I suspect that there are other people who have signed up. I am going to ask us just to take a five-minute break, hopefully in place, so that we can start right in, because I want to make sure that we get everybody and get everybody done on time.

So we will take a just a five-minute break. If you are leaving, and I hope that you're not, but if you are leaving, I just want to thank you for coming and we appreciate your attendance and your participation, but hopefully you'll stay. In just a few minutes, we will start up again.

(WHEREUPON, a recess was had.)

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Okay. Can we get started, please. Okay. Great. Thank you for your cooperation.

Our first three speakers as we begin

will be Tom Tramm, Russell Zizek and Nancy Norton Aminer. The first speaker is Tom Tramm. Is Mr. Tramm here?

Great.

MR. TOM TRAMM: Thank you. I am Tom Tramm. I'm a native Illinoisan, born in Wilmington, grew up in Kankakee, lived in Illinois most of my life. I'm a nuclear engineer and a registered professional engineer in Illinois and a member of American Nuclear Society.

First, I'm here to express my support for the DOE Global Nuclear Energy Partnership initiative. This international partnership, I believe, can actually make the world a cleaner and safer place. As it's presently contemplated, the GNEP will very likely encourage and enable the increased use of nuclear energy to meet the rising global demands for electricity. This would probably reduce the environmental burdens of electricity that would have been otherwise generated by fossil fuel combustion. It is appropriate that the DOE's Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement should evaluate the potential benefits of GNEP in reducing airborne

pollutants associated with the combustion of fossil fuels, such as sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides and CO2, and other greenhouse gases that are of growing global concerns.

The Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement should also evaluate the environmental benefits associated with the long-term reductions in the potential environmental impacts of proliferation and terrorism through the permanent elimination of fissile nuclear materials.

Secondly, the PEIS Environmental Impact Statements will be of most value if they consider the complete range of environmental impacts and benefits of all the alternative -- of each alternative. By this, I mean they should conform -- the methodologies used would be most useful if they conformed with the ISO 14040 standard for lifecycle assessment wherein all the contributing chemicals and energy inputs into the processes. And overall environmental impacts are considered.

Third, it's apparent that GNEP would significantly reduce the amount of high level waste that would be sent to the geologic disposal.

Although, the environmental burdens at this stage of the lifecycle are not great, the PEIS should quantify the long-term environmental benefits of reduced high level disposal in facilities such as Yucca Mountain.

Lastly, I would like to say that I worked in nuclear facilities for about 30 years. I found them to be very safe places, and I developed over the years a trust for the NRC process of regulation and oversight of these facilities. And I would urge that the DOE, as they enter into this program, consider building and operating those facilities with that type of oversight. Thank you very much.

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Thank you, sir. (Applause)

Okay. The next speaker is Russell Zizek, to be followed by Nancy Norton Aminer and Jill Kerzisnik.

Is Russell Zizek here? Z-i-z-e-k?

If he is not here, then we'll go directly to Nancy Norton Aminer. And she will be followed by Jill Kerzisnik and then George Stanford.

MS. NANCY NORTON AMINER: Good evening. My name is Nancy Norton Aminer, and I'm with the Grundy County Economic Development Council. The current GE facility is in Grundy County and I'm very familiar with the location in the adjacent industries. Like many others before, and, in fact, everyone before me, the safety and security of the facility is first and foremost.

Grundy County has lived with nuclear energy for many years, specifically since Exelon Dresden station began. We've been the beneficiary of quality jobs, increased tax base and the corporate citizenship of Exelon. The proposed GE facility could provide many of the same benefits. For that reason, we look forward to hearing more and educating ourselves about the proposal before us with GE Nuclear and the Department of Energy.

Grundy County needs and welcomes quality jobs. We have a skilled workforce to support the project, first class construction trades, many of which worked on the original construction of Dresden station and GE and have been active in the outages and maintenance ever since. Grundy County and the surrounding areas also have workers to

supply the full-time permanent jobs with considerable experience in the nuclear industry. Most important, Grundy County residents have lived many years with spent fuel rods stockpiling in the GE, Dresden and adjacent LaSalle and Braidwood stations. This technology may provide the opportunity to minimize the problem and dramatically minimize the hazardous materials that are currently stored in our communities. And I think that's a goal that everyone in this room can share.

We welcome the opportunity to hear more about the project and its potential environmental and economic benefits, all of which are needed in Grundy County.

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Thank you, ma'am. (Applause)

I'd like to call on Jill Kerzisnik. Is Ms. Kerzisnik here?

If not, George Stanford.

FROM THE FLOOR: How do you spell the name?

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): It's S-t-a-n-f-o-r-d. This is Mr. Stanford right here.

To be followed by Jonathan Podbielski.

MR. GEORGE STANFORD: I'm a retired reactor physicist. I'm here to speak in support of the GNEP. Ladies and gentlemen, nuclear power is here. People who would like to see it disappear are out of luck, not only in this country where there is more than 20 reactor licenses are going to be applied for within the coming year, that doesn't mean they will all be turned into reactors, but around the world, reactors are being ordered and planned more and more.

China is building currently and for the next few years at least one dirty coal plant every five or ten days. They are also working very hard to get nuclear power to replace more and more of their coal. India is working hard to implement nuclear power. These countries are going to be recycling their fuel. They have to because uranium is going to run out, the cheap uranium that is, is going to run out if we do not recycle the fuel.

The GNEP is a carefully thought-out plan to deal with the problems that lots of people have mentioned here tonight. On the national level, it does deal with the waste. It reduces the problem

at Yucca -- Yucca Mountain's problems have been due to the long-lived waste that stays radioactive for tens of thousands of years. That is the stuff that will be burned in the fast reactors that are part of GNEP and that reduces the Yucca Mountain problem to a five -- less than 500 years. In less than 500 years, the waste will have decayed to negligible proportions. That then will solve the Yucca Mountain problem for everybody who realizes that it was a long-term waste that was the problem to begin with.

Secondly, it means that no more Yucca Mountains will have to be built. If we do not recycle the waste, we are going to have to build more and more Yucca Mountain repositories in this country, to say nothing of the rest of the world.

Locally, I would certainly like to see it come to Argonne and to Morris. As a resident of Downers Grove, I think it will be very good for the area. Those are excellent facilities potentially. Argonne is and Morris certainly can be, and so I would urge everybody to realize that nuclear power is here. What we have to do is manage it well. It's here. We are going to manage it well or we

are going to manage it badly, and I submit that GNEP is an important step in managing it as best we can.

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Thank you, sir. (Applause)

The next speaker will be Jonathan Podbielski, to be followed by Morgan Davis and then Robert Schwartz.

MR. JONATHAN PODBIELSKI: Hi, I'm a resident here of Joliet. First of all, I'd like to say, I respect the scientists at Argonne. They're real, incredible people that do incredible research there. I'd like to thank them for coming this evening and listening to the people here and what we have to say.

I'm not opposed to nuclear energy. However, scientists from Harvard, MIT, the Federation of American Scientists, the Union of Concerned Scientists all agree that this is a bad idea. I mean, come on. But, again, this is backed by the Bush Administration. Do I need to say more? (Laughter) Look at Iraq, you know. Okay.

Of course, we need jobs, you know. We

need clean energy. We need a lot of things. Technology, it keeps increasing every day. Fifty to a hundred years from now, we're not going to worry about nuclear waste. We're going to have all that dealt with. We're not going to be worried about this 50 to 100 years from now. So I don't see this urgent need to deal with this right now.

I think the main point I want to say -- I am going to have to read this, what I wrote. This comes from the Union of Concerned Scientists. Everybody keeps talking about generating less waste, you know. What are you guys reading? What planet are you on?

I'll read this to you. First, there is no spent fuel storage crisis that warrants such a drastic change in course. Hardened interim storage of spent fuel in dry casks is an economically viable and secure option for at least 50 years.

Second, reprocessing does not reduce the need for storage and disposal of radioactive waste. And geological repository would still be required. Plutonium constitutes only with 1 percent of the spent fuel from U.S. reactors. After reprocessing, the remaining material will be in several different

waste forms. And the total volume of nuclear waste will have been increased by a factor of 20 or more. Twenty or more. There is not less waste. There is a lot more, including level waste and plutonium contaminated waste.

The largest component of the remaining material is uranium, which is also waste product, because it is contaminated and undesirable for reuse in reactors. Even if the uranium is classified as low level waste, new low level waste facilities would have to be built to dispose of it. And to make a significant reduction in the amount of high level nuclear waste that would require disposal, the used fuel would need to be reprocessed and reused many times with an extremely high degree of efficiency, which is very expensive and would take years.

For example, in 1999, the Department of Energy estimated it would cost $279 billion over 118-year period to fully implement a reprocessing and recycling program for the entire inventory of U.S. spent fuel. I mean, come on. That's from the Union of Concerned Scientists. You can go to their website at www.UCSUSA.org. I encourage all of you

to do that. Although, it does sound like everyone's been doing their homework. It sounds like we have a lot of educated people in here.

I think I will end with that. Good luck to us all. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Thank you.

(Applause)

Morgan Davis, then followed by Robert Schwartz and George Strejcek.

MS. MORGAN DAVIS: Hello, my name is Morgan Davis. And I do have a confession to make. I was not planning on talking tonight, because this is my first community meeting and my first time representing the nuclear industry, as well as the community I live in. And I do also want to make it aware, that all the people that do work at these sites do work in the community and do have the same concerns as you people in this room. And we're doing something to address those issues and to engineer them and to find a solution. And I also challenge all of you to be a part of that and support the scientific community to produce hard facts and a solution for everybody.

I wanted to start out by making the fact

that nuclear power is heavily regulated, and can I say that as an environmental advocate, as well. We are regulated by the NRC, which most of you are aware, the EPA and IEMA, and we do produce reports to them and warrant inspections as felt necessary not only by the agency, but by us.

We have worldwide peer groups. We have INPO, which is a nationally recognized organization. We pull experts from every single plant in the U.S. They visit, they benchmark other plants, they bring good ideas to, one, reduce radiation to the workers, to promote better environmental programs, to strengthen chemistry operations, so we do focus on excellence and we do as an industry promote what's good for our employees, the community and the environment. And I also want to mention that we do have a worldwide organization called WANO, which many of you, I hope, are aware. It's something that models INPO, and we encourage all different kinds of countries, experts from all over the world to come and benchmark our programs and we go and benchmark theirs.

And we also go cross training with Korea

and China. We also help with their operations. They also help with ours. We are a very informed community, and we try to strive for excellence within the whole U.S. and worldwide.

One thing, as an environmental advocate, I do want to address is greenhouse gases. This is not a U.S. problem solely. It is a problem for us, but the most greenhouse gases are coming out of China and Southern Africa because of biomass burning. However, even though it is not happening as much at home, those aerosols produced from biomass burning are hitting our coasts. We are breathing the air and the smoke from those countries.

Now, this initiative, it may not be the solution, it may be on the right path. We will see where that ends up, but one thing I can say is that it is in the right direction, addressing a worldwide issue as greenhouse gases, because this is the only way we can really effectively educate and do some kind of part in giving some kind of direction to those countries that need it.

One thing that was addressed here was the transportation of the nuclear waste. The

nuclear waste is here, we do have it, and it is going to keep piling up until Yucca opens. Whether or not we have a facility here or whether or not we have Yucca Mountain, it's still going to be transported, through not only here, but other states that don't even have nuclear reactors are going to be forced to have that through. Now, nobody wants it in their backyard, but it's here. It's not going away. We need to process it. And if transportation is an issue, it's not going to go away. It's going to happen regardless, so we can either choose to handle it locally and minimize that risk or we can ship it out and it may not be in your backyard, but it will be in somebody else's. And if you want to be able for that, that's fine, but personally I don't feel safe doing that to other people that may not be at this meeting tonight. But that is up for this community to discuss.

So, in conclusion, all the statements I made may support GNEP, may not support GNEP, but there needs to be a solution. And I challenge everybody in this room not only to come up here and talk about it and think of possible solutions, but

I ask you to support hard science and support your youth to come and develop new strategies of how to meet this and support your engineering and scientific community and challenge them, as far as your agencies, your local agencies, to do harder, stricter regulations or whatever may come from this.

I think that's all I have. Thank you for your time. That's it.

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Thank you very much. (Applause)

I just remind you before the end, if any of you have written comments that you would like to submit in addition to your oral comments or other material, please don't forget or hesitate to do that this evening.

The next speaker is Robert Schwartz, to be followed by George Strejcek and Linda Painter.

MR. ROBERT SCHWARTZ: Thank you. I'm Robert Schwartz. I live in Shorewood, Illinois, which is about 15 miles downwind of Dresden Nuclear Power Station. I'm a member of the Boilermakers Union and our members have built and maintained the nuclear facilities around here in conjunction with

the other building tradesmen. And at night when I go to bed, I fall asleep. I feel safe. I'm not worried about what's going on in the nuclear plants, and I respectfully request the Department of Energy consider the Morris facility because of the GE reprocessing center that's already there. The infrastructure's there, the spent fuel's there, and the craftsmen are there to process this fuel.

Thank you very much.

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Thank you, sir.

(Applause)

Okay. Our next speaker is George Strejcek, to be followed by Linda Painter and Kathy Gere.

MR. GEORGE STREJCEK: Thank you very much. It's rather difficult for me to make this presentation. First of all, I don't impugn the integrity or intelligence or the dedication of the gentlemen who have spoken here. I think the problem with many scientists who work on a project all their lives and invest themselves in it, they lose sight of exactly what direction it's headed. This breeder reactor technology is very old technology. It has been around since 1966. The

government has spent lots and lots of money investing in breeder reactor technology going back to 1966.

The Clinch River nuclear reactor, billions of dollars were poured into the project before it was ultimately abandoned. The integral fast reactor was discontinued by the Clinton Administration in 1994, because of safety factors. The Japanese who worked along with Argonne National Laboratory at Argonne was continued on with this technology. They built a breeder reactor in Japan. Three years after the project terminated in the United States, the breeder reactor, the plutonium reactor in Japan caught fire. The chief engineer tried to conceal this from the Japanese diet. There was a surveillance video, black and white, that surfaced. The gentleman committed suicide by jumping off the seventh floor of the Dieache building. I'm sure these gentlemen are aware of this.

There is nothing for nothing in science, okay? There is always a penalty you are going to pay for any technology, and all of us are aware of the greenhouse gas problem that is afflicting the

world worldwide. The Clinton Administration, I think, was science-based science. What we have with the Bush Administration is faith-based science, okay? (Laughter) And I think the inherent danger of the plutonium reactor is that it uses liquid sodium as a coolant, okay? All of you are aware of the enviable safety record of the Nuclear Navy. They use water reactors, okay?

The problem with liquid sodium as a coolant, and you gentlemen are welcome to interrupt me at any point, is this material catches fire on contact with air and explodes in contact with water. Probably all of you over the age of 40 have seen Russian submarines in the Bering Sea surfaced with the crew on deck and U.S. Navy ships hovering around to rescue the crew, because the reactor caught on fire. Guess what type of reactor the Russian nuclear fleet had? Plutonium reactors. They're very fast. Soviet submarines were very fast in acceleration.

But my chief concern is plutonium itself. And I don't have to worry about being charged with plagiarism since I wrote this report. So I will quote myself. Beyond concerns for arms

proliferation in plutonium-based reactor economy is the possibility for release of plutonium in an aerosol form. Anti-nuclear proponents state that any plutonium oxide release poses an immediate threat to human and animal life. The incidence of cancers in humans as a consequence of exposure to plutonium is not well documented, however, a study was performed with beagle dogs by Baron Thompson in 1974. Induced bronchial alveolar cancers in these animals was initiated with .049. That's 49 thousandths of 1 gram of plutonium 239 deposited per gram of bloodless lung tissue. One hundred percent of the animals developed lung cancer.

If one extrapolates these numbers to the biomass of lung tissue in an adult human being, the inhaled dose necessary to induce bronchial alveolar cancer becomes 28 micrograms. That's 28 millionths of a gram. This amount may be, in fact, the upper limit necessary to induce alveolar cancer in man. Studies of uranium miners would indicate that cigarette smoking magnifies the effects of inhalation of uranium or plutonium oxide.

In a plutonium-based energy economy, which this program essentially is, engineers claim

99.99 retention of plutonium within the reactor system. Given the known toxicity of plutonium 239, such claims are based on zero release scenarios.

Following a major fire in 1969 at Rocky Flats Arsenal, Colorado, engineers claim that less than 1 milligram of plutonium was released to the environment. Dr. Edward Martel stated in 1970 that between one-fourth and one-half pound of plutonium had escaped from Rocky Flats Arsenal and it was detectable as far as 10 miles away. Dr. Martel's findings were confirmed by Atomic Energy Commission.

Plutonium stored in leaky barrels at the site had flowed into the ground, dried and ultimately become airborne, okay? I am for nuclear power, but I am not for nuclear power close to highly developed and highly populated areas like Darien and DuPage County, where I live, in Downers Grove.

Again, I believe these gentlemen are well intentioned. I am very concerned about greenhouse gases and climate change, global warming. Apparently the Reagan or the Bush Administration is now on the cusp of accepting

these facts, so we do need nuclear power, but I'm very suspect of these plants being built close to densely populated areas.

Thanks so much. (Applause)

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Thank you.

Okay. Our next speaker is Linda Painter, to be followed by Kathy Gere and Maureen Headington.

MS. LINDA PAINTER: My name is Linda Painter. As President of Timberlake Civic Association, I represent a homeowners association adjacent to Argonne National Lab. We are the closest neighbor to Argonne National Lab. Our association is comprised of 776 homes.

At our last meeting on February 6th, we discussed your proposed nuclear project at length. There were several conclusions that were a result of that meeting.

No. 1. We are in support of the present nuclear research which is occurring at Argonne National Lab.

2. Historically, we have been in support of the D&D of the nuclear reactors at Argonne National Lab.

3. We have been in support of removal of nuclear waste products from the premises.

Although we support many of the types of research that is being done at Argonne, we cannot support the expanded nuclear research at Argonne primarily due to the population density of Metropolitan Chicago. There is a junior high and a private elementary school directly across the expressway from Argonne and two other elementary schools within three-fourths of mile from the entrance to Argonne. There are many families with children living and playing in our neighborhood surrounding the Lab. Due to a number of our homes still receiving their drinking water on private wells, our underground environment is always of concern.

Surrounding Argonne is one of the most popular forest preserves in the country, providing many forms of outdoor activities, including cycling, hiking, horseback riding, cross country skiing, bird watching and many others. Even though there may not be a real danger, there may be a perceived danger relating to Argonne doing in-depth nuclear research, which ultimately would affect our

property values.
We have gained a trusting relationship with the administrators of Argonne National Lab and the Department of Energy and have built a confidence that Argonne is a safe and responsible asset to our community. This trust has taken time and effort of many people over the past decade to accomplish. Real or perceived, I would not like to see the feeling of safety we have been -- we have living next to Argonne to be lost.

Also at the meeting, the project being proposed for Morris was discussed. Although we are not adjacent to Morris, we feel that this area also has a population density too high for the proposed type of nuclear project. We feel that there are many other places within the United States that are less density populated where this type of work can be done. We would like the Department of Energy to consider all of our communities' concerns, including population density, nearby schools, private wells, the surrounding forest preserve and property values when preparing the environmental impact statement.

Thank you. (Applause)

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Thank you, Ms. Painter.

Our next speaker is Kathy Gere, and she would be followed by Maureen Headington and Bill Bromer.

MS. KATHY GERE: Hello. I'm a concerned citizen, like a lot of you out there, and I guess when I hear people talking about nuke as clean energy, I worry about that, because, you know, there is all of these pollutants that come from it, and we've already heard a lot of people talk about it, so I am not going to get into that. So that adds a tremendous burden to our environment.

There are alternatives that are much cleaner. We have solar available, we have wind, we have -- maybe tide is still being researched and developed. Thermal energy is out there, syngas possibly, which is created from the burning of garbage. New York City, as a matter of fact, is planning on going ahead with this. So there are other alternatives that are cleaner and cost effective and long term. Yeah, long term in the fact that our children are going to have to be dealing with this waste product long term. Cost

effective today -- well, okay. I don't know. I'm not sure about that. We factor in the cost of people's lives, increased cancer around Chernobyl, around that incident. You know, anything that spills, you know, when they're being transported, there is cost associated there. There's lots of costs associated with producing nuclear energy that we haven't really looked at.

You know, people say that solar is too expensive. I don't know. Right now we have the technology to produce enough energy from solar to turn the lights on in every single house in the U.S. right now, if we wanted to pursue that. And it's definitely much safer and cleaner and the people who have to work in that industry wouldn't be at risk themselves. There is no pollution from it. You know, it's just a safer industry. The people are protected. We don't have to worry about them getting cancer if they're working with solar technology. We don't have to worry about the waste. Same thing with some of these other technologies that I mentioned, safe and secure.

You know, I just don't feel like nuclear energy would be safe and secure. I don't see how

it could be. There is too many opportunities for people to get ahold of it that shouldn't have the waste products, and there could be a lot of problems which people already mentioned, so I don't think I need to go there, either.

Worldwide, just some statistics. In 2000, there were over 220,000 tons of nuclear waste produced in 2000. We estimate approximately 10,000 increase each year after that. So you can do the math, and if it takes -- even if you were to recycle it and it reduces the life to 500 years instead of thousands, it still accumulates and it still has to go someplace, so we still have to deal with it somehow. So it's far from clean. It's far from cost effective. It definitely affects future generations in a negative way. It's not safe or secure and Greenpeace certainly doesn't support it.

Thank you.

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Thank you.

(Applause)

Our next speaker is Maureen Headington, to be followed by Bill Bromer and Tony Brncich.

MS. MAUREEN HEADINGTON: In December 2001 when I went looking, thinking about what holiday gifts

to give to my family, I ended up giving everyone, friends and family, packets of potassium iodine, wrapped in nice little boxes with ribbons on it. 9/11 had occurred three months previous, and at that time I was Vice President of the Illinois Environmental Council in Springfield, and I learned through that -- I was shocked, because I lived in the Chicago area my entire life. I never knew that we had more nuclear plants than any other state in the nation. And after 9/11 when we were waiting for another shoe to fall, would it fall here. I also learned that Governor Pataki made sure that every single person within a radius of a nuclear plant in New York was given potassium iodine.

So it made me question, and I questioned the Governor's office here, Governor Ryan. And the response I got was, because I had learned also that the federal government was willing to give it out free to any states who wanted it, so that their residents would have benefit. Potassium iodine, by the way, protects the thyroid, but you've got to take it pretty immediately after a disaster.

Well, the response from Governor Ryan, I understand he rejected the offer by the federal

government to give it to us. I questioned his rationale, and it was this: He said, if we have a disaster here, I don't want people to think, through false notion, that they can take a pill and it will be okay. What they have to do is get out.

Well, that led me to think about all the times I sit on the Stevenson during rush hour, not moving, and that's just the workforce that gets -- that goes home at the hour I do. What if we all tried to get out of here at the same time. Folks, you're going nowhere. So your alternative, then, is to stay in, seal up your doors and windows as best you can, and then try to figure out when is it safe to leave, and who do you trust to tell you when it is safe to leave. And when you do leave, even if you were to leave on the Stevenson, how do you know if you should go east or west or north or south. Where is the plume going, and is the wind changing that's carrying it.

So when it comes down to it, I think my perspective, if we err, we have to err on the side of caution always. I have such respect for scientists. However, if you want an operation, go see a surgeon. If you want a war, go see your

generals.

I know that these folks feel very strongly about what they do, but I -- there isn't a single personal life, I don't care what their title, what their expertise, MIT, IIT, I don't care what their educational level, I wouldn't trust anyone to say to me and my family, it's safe. Because, quite frankly, we haven't seen what it's like. I would suggest you take out the video, Chernobyl Heart. You will weep when you watch it. You will get a sense of what it's like. The Chernobyl necklace that the children, because their necks are all cut open to get rid of cancerous thyroids. So, I mean, we are talking about something very, very serious.

I had put together some remarks, but in comment to some of the things that I have heard, someone mentioned they would take a tornado -- that this is akin to a tornado. Folks, I'd take a tornado any day over a nuclear disaster, and I'd take my chances in it.

In terms of the gentleman who spoke, and I don't mean this derogatory, but I feel that it's, if we are going to be exchanging ideas, it is

important, I heard the gentleman from Argonne say that they have been working for decades, and he mentioned that several times, working for decades. What is 10 years, 20 years, 30 years, 50 years compared to the life of radioactivity? Some of these things have lives of thousands, even a million years. So the numbers of decades Argonne has worked compared to that?

I heard someone talk about our jobs are dependent. The biggest sector where there is going to be development and jobs is in green technology. We haven't begun, because we, as a country, if you elect -- and I'm bipartisan -- but if you elect oil people, you pretty much know what the policy is going to be. If we start electing green people, it's untold what the jobs will be and that they will be safe.

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): One minute, please.

MS. HEADINGTON: Okay. In terms of Commander in Chief's logic, terrorists only have to be right once. In the alternative, I would say these folks only have to be wrong once.

So, again, I think we need to err on the side of caution. I will tell you that the best

power I think is people power. I don't think we have been given proper notification. Most of us found out about this through a friend. Thank goodness for David Kraft, Nuclear Energy Information Service. I told many people who are here today about this. My paper didn't cover it. I called the managing editor. Didn't know about it. If notice was served in papers, why isn't it in the papers we read? And why, for Pete's sake didn't you call our Village Halls where they have meetings every two weeks and these are televised, these have newspaper cover them. If you want word out, then put it out. But I -- I assure you that if the community at-large knew about this, you wouldn't have -- this is a good turn out, I suspect, but there would be a thousand people here. There would be --

FROM THE FLOOR: Especially people who live by Argonne.

MS. HEADINGTON: Absolutely.

FROM THE FLOOR: And I think notices could have been put in their mailboxes easily.

MS. HEADINGTON: And I think people power is the biggest thing. I have been involved in three

things that have -- I never thought that my voice would matter. In my community, we stopped a toxic waste burner. Attorney Keith Harley, thank you, thank you for working with you. It was already well into the permit process. Take on the trash industry. I didn't know anything about, but I learned about it and they're gone. We killed 34 such projects. So don't feel that we have to accept this in our communities, on our streets, on our highways. These people are paid. We are not. I have never been paid for my work.

Napalm shipments coming from California through -- on our rail lines through to East Chicago, Indiana, to burn in cement kilns, because they have laws that protect them in California. When I checked with Washington's environmental organizations, I said what's going with these napalm shipments that I found out covert operation by the U.S. Navy? My husband, he knows not to do battle with me, because I took on the U.S. Navy and we won. We stopped the trains. They were already headed here. 23 million pounds of napalm in leaking casks that were causing cancer in California, but you can't burn it there. You could

burn it here.

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): I am going to have to ask you to --

MS. HEADINGTON: I will finish this last sentence.

When I called Washington and said, "Give me the lay of the land," they said, "The big boys know exactly where to go, to the environmentally unconscious Midwest." Folks, we have been dumb for a long time. We're getting smart. We need to stop these things. Illinois should not be the nuclear capital of the nation.

Thank you. (Applause and yeahs)

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Okay. Thanks.

Our next speaker is Bill Bromer, to be followed by Tony Brncich.

MR. BILL BROMER: Thank you. I'm Bill Bromer. Mr. Black, as you and your team prepare this draft impact statement --

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Mr. Bromer, could I just interrupt for a second. I have been told that when you leave, be very, very careful. There's a slick layer of ice that's developing, so be careful both walking and driving.

I'm sorry to interrupt.

MR. BROMER: No problem.

As you and your team prepare this draft environmental impact statement, I think that you need to consider some other alternatives than the two that were presented tonight. The no action alternative is prescribed by law. The only other alternative you have is the GNEP proposal.

I'm sure you have bright enough people in your team to come up with some other alternatives to be addressed besides simply locations in there. The other thing I would like you to consider -- not to consider, to do in your environmental consequences section of your impact statement, is that you consider worst case scenarios. For example, during transportation of hazardous material, they oftentimes use historical accident rates and things like that. But at the end, in the result of it, they're looking at average rates. They're not looking at the worst case scenario. And in this case, the worse case scenario, a small spill, even of casks that are supposedly impenetrable during transportation, they can still -- it can still happen. They can still

be broken open, and we need to know what would happen. And I'd like to see that in the impact statement.

The other thing I'd like to see in the impact statement is the worst case scenarios of what happens if there's a spill or an accident that occurs at the plant. These plants are made by humans, they're run by humans. I don't know about you, but I make mistakes all the time. And mistakes happen. No matter how many safeguards you have, there is mistakes. And I would like to know before I decide what the worst case scenario is, I'd would like to know what that is, what the effects of that are going to be on our streams, on our rivers, on our air and on the people around us. It might turn out that the worst case scenario is very, very unlikely and you could have a probability assigned to that, but I think it is important that we know that.

Thank you very much.

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Thank you, Mr. Bromer. (Applause)

And the final person that I have on my list this evening is Tony Brncich.

MR. TONY BRNCICH: Thank you. It's not by accident that I'm the last speaker. I like to listen to all the comments and address the situation.

I am embarrassed about our community here in New Lenox. I live about two blocks from here. And, literally, I could have rode my bike here, although I didn't. And I think living in this community for over 14 years and within a mile of here the entire 40 years of my life, this community is very tight. And there isn't an organization or anything that happens here without somebody being aware of it. And in this room, I have heard people from Darien, from Downers Grove, from Chicago, Wilmington probably being the closest. There's only four people and we all live within a block from each other, and I think that's an embarrassment on our community. If it's a lack of being notified, I guess that would be my biggest comment, my biggest concern, is that it was posted in the paper that is a penny saver paper in this area, and that's all I have seen it. It might have been in other places. And I think with something of this magnitude, people would be able to fill

something like the United Center with. I personally don't think this is a good turn out. And, you know, it's a big issue, and I like to know what is going on in my community.

I think there is -- nuclear power is here. I mean, I don't know the first thing about it, other than my lights come on, and it's because of the three power plants within 30 miles of here. And the bottom line is, is this stuff is being buried in the ground. And not knowing, not being a scientist, which I respect very much, not being an environmentalist -- I shouldn't say I'm not an environmentalist, but not part of an organization -- the bottom line is, is we're burying this stuff. And it can't be good.

There has got to be another way to clean it up. And nuclear power is not going away. As the one gentleman commented, there is 20 permits out there or applications for permits to build more. We are not going to stop the building of it, and the main reason we are not going to stop the building of it, is when I was listening to everybody, I counted in this room, and I missed all the lights up there, there's 120 lights in this

room, and, you know, I give you credit, that they're not all on. (Laughter) But, you know, going through the neighborhoods, most people waste electricity.

And so I'm looking at both sides of it, that if you -- instead of building one of these plants and transporting, which is probably my biggest fear is transporting the waste from out of the area to here or away, as somebody commented in somebody else's backyard, is I would think that with the brains that we have in this country, that we could clean up the waste on the facility that it is sitting on. Now, is that going to cost billions of dollars, trillions of dollars? Absolutely. And what that's going to do is raise the price and bring down the profits of electrical companies that are running these facilities, but what it's going to do is cause half of these lights to be on, and maybe not even installed at all. And, you know, I think the American people are just wasteful. And if you are -- and if you don't care about being wasteful and you want to spend the money, then don't complain about your electric bill.

Same with the idea of the communities

and people building houses in the area and they're building in Morris area and they are building in Wilmington and Braidwood. One gentleman made a comment that he moved there, maybe he works there, but he's living in the area, and, you know, we are not going to take down these plants. We have proven that with Dresden, which is one the oldest nuclear power plants there is. And it's not going away. It might be upgraded, but it's not going away.

So as much as the environmentalists in the room, and I respect you, it's not about if we should have nuclear power or shouldn't have nuclear power. This man came here today or this group came here to get concerns about what we're going to do about the waste of it. And the waste, in my opinion, again not knowing the first thing about it, it can't be good to be burying it in our ground and just leaving it sit there for, not future generations, because we're talking thousands of years, from what I understand, that this stuff will sit there. And I just don't -- I just don't agree with the fact of moving it anywhere. And I think there is a way to -- there has got to be a way to

clean it up onsite. And I think the gentlemen and the ladies in the room that are the scientists, I think that should be the main concern is trying to figure out how to do it onsite without moving it and taking it anywhere.

I don't think it's a political issue. At least I hope it's not. I hope it's not a financial issue as far as somebody trying to profit off of it. I was a tradesman for years as a carpenter, and I'm not at this time, but I respect the idea of jobs in the area, but I don't think it's about jobs in the area. It's about getting rid of something that could literally kill us and is killing us.

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): One minute, please.

MR. BRNCICH: Okay. The cancer rate in this area is tremendous. My mon has suffered it, my mother-in-law has suffered it. Past employees, when I worked within a mile of Dresden nuclear power plant, employees have had cancer. And, you know, is it from the nuclear power plant or is it from the stuff that's buried in the ground for all these years? Is it in the water? You know, again, I don't have the answers. I didn't plan to speak.

I don't have anything rehearsed, but all I know is that it can't be good to just leave it in the ground. So I endorse it. I don't like the idea that's it's going to be downwind from me, but, you know, unfortunately, that's where the waste is sitting, and I think that is where it should be processed.

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): Thank you very much (Applause)

That was the last speaker I have on my list. We will be here until 9:30. It is now about 11 minutes past 9:00. We will take a recess at this point. If you are leaving us, thank you so much for your time and your comments and obviously some hard work in preparing your comments. You're certainly welcome to stay around. I will open the hearing again if we have any speakers before 9:30.

Thank you.

(WHEREUPON, a recess was had.)

MR. LAWSON (Facilitator): We have had no other people who have signed up to speak, and so this concludes this session of the scoping meetings on the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership, PEIS. Thank you all for your participation and comments

and also please note that you may continue to submit comments on the scope of the PEIS until the comment period closes on April 4. Check your packet for explicit information regarding how and where to submit those comments.

This meeting is adjourned. And thanks to our court reporter for excellent work.

(WHEREUPON, the hearing was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.)

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS:
COUNTY OF DU PAGE)

I, JACQUELINE M. TIMMONS, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of Illinois, do hereby certify that I reported in shorthand the proceedings had at the hearing aforesaid, and that the foregoing is a true, complete and correct transcript of the proceedings of said hearing as appears from my stenographic notes so taken and transcribed under my personal direction.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I do hereunto set my hand at Chicago, Illinois, this 19th day of March, 2007.

Certified Shorthand Reporter

C.S.R. Certificate No. 84-2949.